arXiv:1108.4829v1 [math.OA] 24 Aug 2011

RANGES OF BIMODULE PROJECTIONS AND REFLEXIVITY

G. K. ELEFTHERAKIS AND I. G. TODOROV

Abstract. We develop a general framework for reflexivity in dual Banach spaces, motivated by the question of when the weak* closed linear span of two reflexive masa-bimodules is automatically reflexive. We establish an affirmative answer to this question in a number of cases by examining two new classes of masa-bimodules, defined in terms of ranges of masa-bimodule projections. We give a number of corollaries of our results concerning operator and spectral synthesis, and show that the classes of masa-bimodules we study are operator synthetic if and only if they are strong operator Ditkin.

1. Introduction

Operator synthesis, introduced by W. Arveson [2] and subsequently developed by V.S. Shulman and L. Turowska [20], [21], is an operator theoretic version of the well-known concept of spectral synthesis in Harmonic Analysis. Due to the work of W. Arveson, J. Froelich, J. Ludwig, N. Spronk and L. Turowska [2], [7], [18], [14], it is known that the notion of spectral synthesis "embeds" into that of operator synthesis in that, for a large class of locally compact groups G, given a closed subset E of G, there is a canonical way to produce a subset E^* of the direct product $G \times G$, so that the set E satisfies spectral synthesis if and only if the set E^* satisfies operator synthesis. Thus, the well-known, and still open, problem of whether the union of two synthetic sets is synthetic can be viewed as a special case of the problem asking whether the union of two operator synthetic sets is operator synthetic.

The notion of operator synthesis is closely related to that of reflexivity. Recall that a subspace $\mathcal{S}$ of the space $\mathcal{B}(H_1, H_2)$ of all bounded linear operators from a Hilbert space H_1 into a Hilbert space H_2 is called *reflexive* if it coincides with its *reflexive hull* [13]

$$\operatorname{Ref} \mathcal{S} = \{T \in \mathcal{B}(H_1, H_2) : Tx \in \overline{\mathcal{S}x}, \text{ for all } x \in H_1\}.$$

Reflexive spaces are automatically closed in the weak* (and even the weak operator) topology. In the present paper we initiate the study of the following question:

Question 1.1. *Given two reflexive spaces $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(H_1, H_2)$, when is the weak* closure $\overline{\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{T}}^{w^*}$ of their sum reflexive?*

Date: 18 August 2011.

Question 1.1 is closely related to the question of whether the union of two operator synthetic sets is operator synthetic. Indeed, an affirmative answer to Question 1.1, in the case $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ are bimodules over maximal abelian selafdjoint algebras (masa-bimodules for short) with operator synthetic supports, implies that the union of these supports is operator synthetic.

We obtain an affirmative answer to Question 1.1 in a number of cases. Crucial for our considerations is the class of masa-bimodules consisting of all ranges of weak* continuous bimodule projections. The latter maps have attracted considerable attention in the literature, as they are precisely the idempotent Schur multipliers (see [11]). We study a class of masa-bimodules, which we call *approximately $\mathfrak{J}$-injective* masa-bimodules, that are defined as the intersections of sequences of ranges of uniformly bounded weak* continuous masa-bimodule projections, as well as the more general class of *$\mathfrak{J}$-decomposable* masa-bimodules (Definition 2.6). Our most general result concerning Question 1.1 is that it has an affirmative answer when $\mathcal{S}$ is a reflexive masa-bimodule, while $\mathcal{T}$ is the intersection of finitely many $\mathfrak{J}$-decomposable masa-bimodules. In particular, $\overline{\mathcal{S}+\mathcal{T}}^{w^*}$ is reflexive whenever $\mathcal{S}$ is reflexive and $\mathcal{T}$ is a masa-bimodule (or a CSL algebra) of finite width. These results are given as an application of a more general result obtained in Section 2, where a new reflexive hull in the setting of dual Banach spaces is introduced and examined. We hope that this general setting may be applied in other instances as well.

Sections 4 and 5 are devoted to connections with spectral and operator synthesis. As a corollary of our results, we show that the union of an operator synthetic set and a set of finite width is operator synthetic. This extends the results of [20] and [23], where it was shown that sets of finite width are operator synthetic. We give some applications concerning unions of sets of spectral synthesis in locally compact groups. We show that the supports of the ranges of weak* continuous masa-bimodule projections are always operator synthetic. While we do not know whether the same holds for the supports of approximately $\mathfrak{J}$-injective ones, we show that these sets satisfy a weaker form of operator synthesis (see Theorem 5.2). Moreover, we show that the supports of the (more general) $\mathfrak{J}$-decomposable masa-bimodules are operator synthetic if and only if they are strong operator Ditkin. We note that it is an open question in Harmonic Analysis (resp. Operator Theory) whether every synthetic set (resp. every operator synthetic set) is necessarily Ditkin (resp. operator Ditkin).

In Section 6 we address the converse to Question 1.1, and obtain sufficient conditions which ensure the reflexivity of $\mathcal{T}$, provided $\mathcal{S}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{S}+\mathcal{T}}^{w^*}$ are both reflexive.

2. The general framework

In this section we set up the general framework, introducing a reflexive hull for subspaces of a dual Banach space relative to a family of commuting weak* continuous idempotents. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a dual Banach space with a fixed predual $\mathcal{X}_*$, and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ be the space of all bounded linear operators on $\mathcal{X}$. As usual, we denote by $\|\phi\|$ the norm of an operator $\phi \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$. An *idempotent* in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ is an element $\phi \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\phi^2 = \phi$. If $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, for the rest of this section we will denote by $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ the closure of $\mathcal{S}$ in the weak* topology arising from the identity $\mathcal{X} = (\mathcal{X}_*)^*$, and by referring to a "closed set" (resp. "closed subspace"), we will always mean a set (resp. a subspace), closed in the weak* topology of $\mathcal{X}$. The convergence of nets of elements of $\mathcal{X}$ will also always be with respect to the weak* topology. Closures in the norm topology of $\mathcal{X}$ will not appear explicitly in the paper.

Let $\mathfrak{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ be a Boolean algebra of pairwise commuting weak* continuous idempotents with top element the identity operator id and bottom element the zero operator. This means that $\mathfrak{C}$ is closed under complementation (that is, $\phi \in \mathfrak{C}$ implies $\phi^\perp \overset{def}{=} \mathrm{id} - \phi \in \mathfrak{C}$), contains 0 and id, and $\phi + \psi - \phi\psi, \phi\psi \in \mathfrak{C}$ whenever $\phi, \psi \in \mathfrak{C}$. We denote by $\operatorname{Ran}\phi$ the range of an idempotent ϕ. It is easy to verify that if $\phi, \psi \in \mathfrak{C}$ then $\operatorname{Ran}\phi \cap \operatorname{Ran}\psi = \operatorname{Ran}(\phi\psi)$ and $\operatorname{Ran}\phi + \operatorname{Ran}\psi = \operatorname{Ran}(\phi + \psi - \phi\psi)$.

Definition 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be a linear subspace.*

(i) The subspace $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ will be called $\mathfrak{C}$-invariant *if $\phi(\mathcal{Y}) \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$ for every $\phi \in \mathfrak{C}$.*

(ii) The subspace $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ will be called $\mathfrak{C}$-injective *if $\mathcal{Y} = \operatorname{Ran}\phi$ for some $\phi \in \mathfrak{C}$.*

(iii) The $\mathfrak{C}$-reflexive hull *of $\mathcal{Y}$ is the subspace*

$$\operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}\mathcal{Y} = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : \text{ if } \phi \in \mathfrak{C} \text{ and } \phi(\mathcal{Y}) = \{0\} \text{ then } \phi(x) = 0\}.$$

The subspace $\mathcal{Y}$ is called $\mathfrak{C}$-reflexive *if $\operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{Y}$.*

We record some elementary properties of the notions introduced in Definition 2.1.

Proposition 2.2. *(i) If $\mathcal{Y}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{Y}_2$ then $\operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}\mathcal{Y}_1 \subseteq \operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}\mathcal{Y}_2$.*

(ii) The intersection of any family of $\mathfrak{C}$-reflexive subspaces is $\mathfrak{C}$-reflexive.

(iii) If $\mathcal{Y}$ is a $\mathfrak{C}$-invariant subspace then $\operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}\mathcal{Y}$ is $\mathfrak{C}$-invariant.

(iv) For every subspace $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, the $\mathfrak{C}$-reflexive hull $\operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}\mathcal{Y}$ is a closed subspace of $\mathcal{X}$.

(v) Every $\mathfrak{C}$-injective space is closed and $\mathfrak{C}$-invariant.

Proof. (i) is trivial.

(ii) Let $\mathcal{Y}_\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{A}$, be a family of $\mathfrak{C}$-reflexive subspaces of $\mathcal{X}$. By (i),

$$\operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\cap_{\alpha\in\mathbb{A}}\mathcal{Y}_\alpha) \subseteq \cap_{\alpha\in\mathbb{A}} \operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}\mathcal{Y}_\alpha = \cap_{\alpha\in\mathbb{A}}\mathcal{Y}_\alpha.$$

The converse inclusion is trivial.

(iii) Let $x \in \operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}\mathcal{Y}$ and $\phi \in \mathfrak{C}$. Suppose that $\psi \in \mathfrak{C}$ annihilates $\mathcal{Y}$. Then $\psi(\phi(x)) = \phi(\psi(x)) = \phi(0) = 0$; thus, $\phi(x) \in \operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}\mathcal{Y}$.

(iv) Let $(x_\alpha) \subseteq \operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}\mathcal{Y}$ be a net converging to x and $\phi \in \mathfrak{C}$ annihilate $\mathcal{Y}$. Then $\phi(x_\alpha) = 0$ for each α and, by the continuity of ϕ, we have that $\phi(x) = 0$; thus, $x \in \operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}\mathcal{Y}$.

(v) Let $\phi, \psi \in \mathfrak{C}$. For every $x = \phi(x)$ we have $\psi(x) = \psi(\phi(x)) = \phi(\psi(x)) \in \operatorname{Ran}\phi$, thus, $\psi(\operatorname{Ran}\phi) \subseteq \operatorname{Ran}\phi$. Thus, $\operatorname{Ran}\phi$ is $\mathfrak{C}$-invariant. To show that $\operatorname{Ran}\phi$ is close, suppose that $(x_\alpha) \in \operatorname{Ran}\phi$ is a net with $x_\alpha \to x$. Then $x_\alpha = \phi(x_\alpha) \to \phi(x)$ and so $x = \phi(x) \in \operatorname{Ran}\phi$. □

Proposition 2.3. *Let $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be a closed $\mathfrak{C}$-invariant subspace and $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be a $\mathfrak{C}$-injective subspace.*

(i) The space $\mathcal{M}$ is $\mathfrak{C}$-reflexive.

(ii) The algebraic sum $\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{M}$ is closed.

(iii) We have $\operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{M}) = \operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{Y}) + \mathcal{M}$. Thus, if $\mathcal{Y}$ is $\mathfrak{C}$-reflexive then $\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{M}$ is $\mathfrak{C}$-reflexive.

Proof. Let $\phi \in \mathfrak{C}$ be an idempotent with range $\mathcal{M}$.

(i) Let $x \in \operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{M}$. By the assumptions on the family $\mathfrak{C}$, we have that $\phi^\perp \in \mathfrak{C}$, and clearly $\phi^\perp(\mathcal{M}) = \{0\}$. It follows that $\phi^\perp(x) = 0$, that is, $x = \phi(x) \in \operatorname{Ran}\phi = \mathcal{M}$.

(ii) Suppose that $(y_\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$ and $(m_\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ are nets such that $y_\alpha + m_\alpha \to x$. The invariance of $\mathcal{Y}$ implies

$$x - \phi(x) = \lim{}_\alpha (y_\alpha + m_\alpha - \phi(y_\alpha) - \phi(m_\alpha)) = \lim{}_\alpha (y_\alpha - \phi(y_\alpha)) \in \mathcal{Y}.$$

Thus, $x = (x - \phi(x)) + \phi(x) \in \mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{M}$.

(iii) Let $x \in \operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{M})$. We will show that $x - \phi(x) \in \operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{Y}$. Suppose that $\psi \in \mathfrak{C}$ annihilates $\mathcal{Y}$. Then $\phi^\perp\psi$ annihilates $\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{M}$; indeed, if $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}$ then

$$\phi^\perp\psi(y + m) = \phi^\perp\psi(y) + \psi\phi^\perp(m) = 0.$$

Since the idempotents in $\mathfrak{C}$ pairwise commute,

$$\phi(\psi(x - \phi(x))) = \phi\psi(x) - \phi\psi(x) = 0.$$

On the other hand, since $x \in \operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{M})$ and $\phi^\perp\psi$ annihilates $\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{M}$, we have that

$$\phi^\perp(\psi(x - \phi(x))) = \phi^\perp\psi(x) = 0.$$

It follows that

$$\psi(x - \phi(x)) = \phi(\psi(x - \phi(x))) + \phi^\perp(\psi(x - \phi(x))) = 0.$$

Thus, $x - \phi(x) \in \operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{Y}$ and hence $x = (x - \phi(x)) + \phi(x) \in \operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{M}$. The second statement in (iii) is now immediate. □

Definition 2.4. *A subspace $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ will be called* approximately $\mathfrak{C}$-injective *if there exists a sequence $(\phi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$ and a constant $C > 0$ such that $\|\phi_n\| \leq C$, $\operatorname{Ran}\phi_{n+1} \subseteq \operatorname{Ran}\phi_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\mathcal{M} = \cap_{n=1}^\infty \operatorname{Ran}\phi_n$. We call any sequence $(\phi_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ with these properties an* associated sequence of idempotents *for $\mathcal{M}$.*

Remarks (i) Let $\mathcal{M}$ and $(\phi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be as in Definition 2.4. Since $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ is itself a dual Banach space (see, for example, paragraph A.3.3 of [3]), the sequence $(\phi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ has a cluster point $\phi \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ in the point-weak* topology. It is easily seen that ϕ is a (not necessarily weak* continuous) idempotent with range $\mathcal{M}$. Moreover, since the ranges $\operatorname{Ran}\phi_n$ are nested, it follows that any (weak*) cluster point of $(\phi_n(x))_{n=1}^\infty$ lies in $\mathcal{M}$.

(ii) Let $\mathcal{M}_j$, $j = 1, \dots, k$, be approximately $\mathfrak{C}$-injective spaces. Then $\mathcal{M} \overset{def}{=} \cap_{j=1}^k \mathcal{M}_j$ is approximately $\mathfrak{C}$-injective. To see this, let $(\phi_n^j)_{n=1}^\infty$ be an associated sequence of idempotents for $\mathcal{M}_j$, $j = 1, \dots, k$. It is easy to see that the sequence $(\phi_n^1 \phi_n^2 \cdots \phi_n^k)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded and the intersection of the ranges of its elements is $\mathcal{M}$.

Theorem 2.5. *Let $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be a closed $\mathfrak{C}$-invariant subspace and $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be an approximately $\mathfrak{C}$-injective subspace.*

(i) The space $\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{M}$ is closed.

(ii) We have $\operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{M}) = \operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{Y}) + \mathcal{M}$. Thus, if $\mathcal{Y}$ is $\mathfrak{C}$-reflexive then $\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{M}$ is $\mathfrak{C}$-reflexive.

Proof. Let $(\phi_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be an associated sequence of idempotents for $\mathcal{M}$.

(i) Suppose that $x \in \overline{\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{M}}$. Proposition 2.3 (ii) implies that

$$x \in \overline{\mathcal{Y} + \operatorname{Ran}\phi_n} = \mathcal{Y} + \operatorname{Ran}\phi_n.$$

Thus, $x = y_n + m_n$, where $y_n \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $m_n \in \operatorname{Ran}\phi_n$, and so

$$x - \phi_n(x) = y_n + m_n - \phi_n(y_n) - \phi_n(m_n) = y_n - \phi_n(y_n) \in \mathcal{Y}$$

by the $\mathfrak{C}$-invariance of $\mathcal{Y}$. Let m be a cluster point of $(\phi_n(x))_{n=1}^\infty$. Then $x = (x - m) + m \in \mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{M}$.

(ii) Let $x \in \operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{M})$. By Proposition 2.3 (iii),

$$x \in \operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{Y} + \operatorname{Ran}\phi_n) = \operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}\mathcal{Y} + \operatorname{Ran}\phi_n.$$

Using Proposition 2.2 (iii), we see as in (i) that

$$x = (x - \phi_n(x)) + \phi_n(x) \in \operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}\mathcal{Y} + \operatorname{Ran}\phi_n.$$

Taking a cluster point of $(\phi_n(x))_{n=1}^\infty$, we conclude that $x \in \operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{M}$. The last two statements are now immediate. ☐

If $(\mathcal{M}_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is a sequence of closed subsets of $\mathcal{X}$, let $\limsup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathcal{M}_n$ be the set of all cluster points of sequences $(x_n)_{n=1}^\infty$, where $x_n \in \mathcal{M}_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Definition 2.6. *A closed subspace $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ will be called* $\mathfrak{C}$- decomposable *if there exists a sequence $(\phi_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$ and a sequence $(\mathcal{W}_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ of $\mathfrak{C}$-injective subspaces of $\mathcal{X}$ such that*

(a) *there exists $C > 0$ with $\|\phi_n\| \leq C$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$;*
(b) *$\mathcal{V} \subseteq \operatorname{Ran}\phi_n + \mathcal{W}_n$ for each n;*
(c) *$\mathcal{W}_n \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ for each n;*
(d) *$\limsup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \operatorname{Ran}\phi_n \subseteq \mathcal{V}$.*

We call the sequence $(\phi_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ an associated sequences of idempotents*, and $(\mathcal{W}_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ an* associated sequences of subspaces, *for $\mathcal{V}$.*

Lemma 2.7. *Let $\mathcal{V}$ be a $\mathfrak{C}$-decomposable subspace with associated sequences $(\phi_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $(\mathcal{W}_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of idempotents and subspaces, respectively. Then*

$$\mathcal{V} = \cap_{n=1}^{\infty}(\mathrm{Ran}\,\phi_n + \mathcal{W}_n) = \limsup{}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\mathcal{W}_n + \limsup{}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\mathrm{Ran}\,\phi_n.$$

Proof. By definition, $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \cap_{n=1}^{\infty}(\mathrm{Ran}\,\phi_n + \mathcal{W}_n)$. Suppose that $x \in \mathrm{Ran}\,\phi_n + \mathcal{W}_n$ for each n and write $x = x_n + w_n$, where $\phi_n(x_n) = x_n$ and $w_n \in \mathcal{W}_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By Proposition 2.2 (v), $\mathcal{W}$ is $\mathfrak{C}$-invariant and hence

$$x - \phi_n(x) = x_n + w_n - \phi_n(x_n) - \phi_n(w_n) = w_n - \phi_n(w_n) \in \mathcal{W}_n.$$

Letting m be a cluster point of $(\phi_n(x))_{n=1}^{\infty}$ (such a cluster point exists since the sequence $(\phi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded), we see that

$$x = (x - m) + m \in \limsup{}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\mathcal{W}_n + \limsup{}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\mathrm{Ran}\,\phi_n.$$

Since $\mathcal{W}_n \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ for each n and $\mathcal{V}$ is closed, we have that $\limsup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\mathcal{W}_n \subseteq \mathcal{V}$. From condition (d), $\limsup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\mathcal{W}_n + \limsup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\mathrm{Ran}\,\phi_n \subseteq \mathcal{V}$. The equalities are established. □

Remarks (i) Every $\mathfrak{C}$-injective subspace is trivially approximately $\mathfrak{C}$-injective. Taking $\mathcal{W}_n = \{0\}$ in Definition 2.6 we see, on the other hand, that every approximately $\mathfrak{C}$-injective subspace is $\mathfrak{C}$-decomposable.

(ii) It follows from Lemma 2.7, Proposition 2.2 and Proposition 2.3 that every $\mathfrak{C}$-decomposable subspace is $\mathfrak{C}$-invariant and $\mathfrak{C}$-reflexive.

(iii) In concrete applications, one often has that the sequence $(\mathcal{W}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in Definition 2.6 is increasing, while the sequence $(\mathrm{Ran}\,\phi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is decreasing. In this case $\limsup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\mathrm{Ran}\,\phi_n = \cap_{n=1}^{\infty}\mathrm{Ran}\,\phi_n$ and $\limsup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\mathcal{W}_n = \overline{\cup_{n=1}^{\infty}\mathcal{W}_n}$.

Theorem 2.8. *Let $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be a closed $\mathfrak{C}$-invariant subspace and $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be a $\mathfrak{C}$-decomposable subspace. Then $\mathrm{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V}) = \overline{\mathrm{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{Y}) + \mathcal{V}}$. In particular, if $\mathcal{Y}$ is $\mathfrak{C}$-reflexive then $\overline{\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V}}$ is $\mathfrak{C}$-reflexive.*

Proof. Let (ϕ_n) and $(\mathcal{W}_n)$ be associated sequences of idempotents and subspaces for $\mathcal{V}$. By Proposition 2.2 (i) and (iv), $\overline{\mathrm{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}\,\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V}} \subseteq \mathrm{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V})$. Fix $x \in \mathrm{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V})$. Letting $\mathcal{M}_n = \mathrm{Ran}\,\phi_n$, we have by Proposition 2.3 (iii) that $\mathrm{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{M}_n + \mathcal{W}_n) = \mathrm{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{Y}) + \mathcal{M}_n + \mathcal{W}_n$. By Proposition 2.2 (i) and Theorem 2.5 (ii), we have that

$$\mathrm{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V}) \subseteq \mathrm{Ref}(\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{W}_n + \mathcal{M}_n) = \mathrm{Ref}(\mathcal{Y}) + \mathcal{W}_n + \mathcal{M}_n$$

and the arguments in the proof of Theorem 2.5 show that

$$x - \phi_n(x) \in \mathrm{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{Y}) + \mathcal{W}_n \subseteq \mathrm{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{Y}) + \mathcal{V}.$$

Choosing a cluster point z of $(\phi_n(x))_{n=1}^{\infty}$, we have that

$$x = (x - z) + z \in \overline{\mathrm{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{Y}) + \mathcal{V}} + \limsup{}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\mathcal{M}_n \subseteq \overline{\mathrm{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{Y}) + \mathcal{V}}.$$

We thus showed that $\mathrm{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V}) \subseteq \overline{\mathrm{Ref}_{\mathfrak{C}}\,\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V}}$ and hence we have equality. The last statement is now immediate. □

Our last aim in this section is Theorem 2.10 which establishes a useful intersection property for $\mathfrak{C}$-decomposable subspaces. First, we need a lemma.

Lemma 2.9. *Let $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be a closed $\mathfrak{C}$-invariant subspace and $\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_k$ be $\mathfrak{C}$-decomposable subspaces. Set $\mathcal{V}_{i,j} = \mathcal{V}_i \cap \cdots \cap \mathcal{V}_j$ if $i \leq j$, and $\mathcal{V}_{i,j} = \mathcal{X}$ if $i > j$. Then, for every $j = 1, \dots, k$, we have*

$$\mathcal{V}_{1,j} \cap \overline{\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V}_{j+1,k}} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V}_{1,k}}.$$

Proof. First note that the spaces $\mathcal{V}_{i,j}$ are $\mathfrak{C}$-invariant since $\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_n$ are $\mathfrak{C}$-invariant. To prove the statement, use backward induction on j. If $j = k$ then the inclusion is trivial. Suppose that it holds for $j + 1$. Let $(\phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an associated sequence of idempotents, and $(\mathcal{W}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an associated sequence of subspaces, for $\mathcal{V}_{j+1}$, and let $\psi_n \in \mathfrak{C}$ be an idempotent with range $\mathcal{W}_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\sigma_n \overset{def}{=} \phi_n + \psi_n - \phi_n \psi_n$ has range $\operatorname{Ran} \phi_n + \mathcal{W}_n$. Set $\rho_n = \psi_n - \phi_n \psi_n$.

Let $x \in \mathcal{V}_{1,j} \cap \overline{\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V}_{j+1,k}}$; we have that

$$x = \phi_n(x) + \rho_n(x) + \sigma_n^{\perp}(x).$$

Since $x \in \overline{\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V}_{j+1}}$, $\mathcal{V}_{j+1} \subseteq \operatorname{Ran} \sigma_n$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ is $\mathfrak{C}$-invariant, we have that $\sigma_n^{\perp}(x) \in \mathcal{Y}$ for each n. On the other hand, by the $\mathfrak{C}$-invariance of $\mathcal{V}_{1,j}$ and the fact that $\operatorname{Ran} \rho_n \subseteq \mathcal{W}_n$, we have that

$$\rho_n(x) \in \mathcal{V}_{1,j} \cap \mathcal{W}_n \subseteq \mathcal{V}_{1,j} \cap \mathcal{V}_{j+1} = \mathcal{V}_{1,j+1}.$$

Since $\overline{\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V}_{j+1,k}}$ is invariant under ρ_n, we conclude that

$$\rho_n(x) \in \mathcal{V}_{1,j+1} \cap \overline{\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V}_{j+1,k}} \subseteq \mathcal{V}_{1,j+1} \cap \overline{\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V}_{j+2,k}} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V}_{1,k}}.$$

Thus, $\rho_n(x) + \sigma_n^{\perp}(x) \in \overline{\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V}_{1,k}}$ for each n.

Let y be a cluster point of $(\phi_n(x))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Then

$$y \in (\limsup\nolimits_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \operatorname{Ran} \phi_n) \cap \mathcal{V}_{1,j} \subseteq \mathcal{V}_{j+1} \cap \mathcal{V}_{1,j} = \mathcal{V}_{1,j+1}.$$

By $\mathfrak{C}$-invariance, y also belongs to $\overline{\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V}_{j+1,k}}$ and hence, by the inductive assumption, $y \in \overline{\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V}_{1,k}}$. On the other hand, $x - y$ is a cluster point of $(\rho_n(x) + \sigma_n^{\perp}(x))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and hence $x = y + (x - y) \in \overline{\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V}_{1,k}}$. $\square$

Theorem 2.10. *Let $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be a closed $\mathfrak{C}$-invariant subspace and $\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_k$ be $\mathfrak{C}$-decomposable subspaces of $\mathcal{X}$. Then*

$$\overline{\mathcal{Y} + \cap_{j=1}^{k} \mathcal{V}_j} = \cap_{j=1}^{k} \overline{\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V}_j}.$$

Moreover, if $\mathcal{Y}$ is $\mathfrak{C}$-reflexive then $\overline{\mathcal{Y} + \cap_{j=1}^{k} \mathcal{V}_j}$ is $\mathfrak{C}$-reflexive.

Proof. By induction, it suffices to show that if $\mathcal{V} = \cap_{j=1}^{k-1} \mathcal{V}_j$ then

$$\overline{\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V}_k} = \overline{\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{V}_k}. \tag{1}$$

Let x be an element of the left hand side of (1). Let $(\phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an associated sequence of maps, and $(\mathcal{W}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an associated sequence of spaces, for $\mathcal{V}_k$. Then, for every n we have that $x = y + \phi_n(x) + y_n$ for some $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $y_n \in \mathcal{W}_n$. Since $\overline{\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V}}$ is invariant under ϕ_n, we have

$$x - \phi_n(x) = y + y_n \in \overline{\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V}} \cap (\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{W}_n).$$

Suppose that $y + y_n = \lim_\alpha(s_\alpha + t_\alpha)$, where $s_\alpha \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $t_\alpha \in \mathcal{V}$. Writing ψ_n for the idempotent in $\mathfrak{C}$ with range $\mathcal{W}_n$, we have

$$y_n = \psi(y_n) = \lim{}_\alpha \psi_n(s_\alpha - y) + \psi_n(t_\alpha).$$

By $\mathfrak{C}$-invariance, $\psi_n(t_\alpha) \in \mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{W}_n \subseteq \mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{V}_k$ and $\psi_n(s_\alpha - y) \in \mathcal{Y}$. It follows that $y_n \in \overline{\mathcal{Y} + (\mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{V}_k)}$, and so $y + y_n \in \overline{\mathcal{Y} + (\mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{V}_k)}$, for every n.

Suppose that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \phi_{n_k}(x) = z$ for some z; thus $z \in \limsup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \operatorname{Ran} \phi_n \subseteq \mathcal{V}_k$. By Lemma 2.9,

$$z \in \mathcal{V}_k \cap \overline{\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V}} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{V}_k}.$$

Also, $x - z = \lim_{k\to\infty}(y + y_{n_k}) \in \overline{\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{V}_k}$. It follows that $x \in \overline{\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{V}_k}$ and (1) is established.

Now suppose that $\mathcal{Y}$ is $\mathfrak{C}$-reflexive. By Theorem 2.8, $\overline{\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V}_j}$ is $\mathfrak{C}$-reflexive for each j. Now Proposition 2.2 (ii) implies that $\cap_{j=1}^k \overline{\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{V}_j}$, and hence $\overline{\mathcal{Y} + \cap_{j=1}^k \mathcal{V}_j}$, is $\mathfrak{C}$-reflexive. □

3. Sums of masa-bimodules

In this section, we apply the results of Section 2 in the case where $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{B}(H_1, H_2)$ for some Hilbert spaces H_1 and H_2, equipped with its canonical weak* topology coming from the identification of $\mathcal{B}(H_1, H_2)$ with the dual space of the space $\mathcal{C}_1(H_2, H_1)$ of all trace class operators from H_2 into H_1.

We first fix notation. Let (X, m) and (Y, n) be standard measure spaces, that is, the measures m and n are regular Borel measures with respect to some Borel structures on X and Y arising from complete metrizable topologies. Let $H_1 = L^2(X, m)$, $H_2 = L^2(Y, n)$, and $\mathcal{D}_1$ (resp. $\mathcal{D}_2$) be the algebra of all multiplication operators on H_1 (resp. H_2) by functions from $L^\infty(X, m)$ (resp. $L^\infty(Y, n)$). It is well-known that $\mathcal{D}_1$ and $\mathcal{D}_2$ are maximal abelian selfadjoint subalgebras (masas) of $\mathcal{B}(H_1)$ and $\mathcal{B}(H_2)$, respectively. A subspace $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(H_1, H_2)$ will be called a *masa-bimodule* if $BTA \in \mathcal{U}$ whenever $A \in \mathcal{D}_1$, $B \in \mathcal{D}_2$ and $T \in \mathcal{U}$.

We need several facts and notions from the theory of masa-bimodules [2], [4], [20]. A subset $E \subseteq X \times Y$ is called *marginally null* if $E \subseteq (X_0 \times Y) \cup (X \times Y_0)$, where $m(X_0) = n(Y_0) = 0$. We call two subsets $E, F \subseteq X \times Y$ *marginally equivalent* (and write $E \cong F$) if the symmetric difference of E and F is marginally null. A set $\kappa \subseteq X \times Y$ is called *ω-open* if it is marginally equivalent to a (countable) union of the form $\cup_{i=1}^\infty \alpha_i \times \beta_i$, where $\alpha_i \subseteq X$ and $\beta_i \subseteq Y$ are measurable, $i \in \mathbb{N}$. The complements of ω-open sets are called *ω-closed*. An operator $T \in \mathcal{B}(H_1, H_2)$ is said to be supported on κ if $M_{\chi_\beta} T M_{\chi_\alpha} = 0$ whenever $(\alpha \times \beta) \cap \kappa \simeq \emptyset$. (Here M_g stands for the operator of multiplication by the function g.) If κ is an ω-closed set, let

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa) = \{T \in \mathcal{B}(H_1, H_2) : T \text{ is supported on } \kappa\}.$$

The space $\mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa)$ is a reflexive masa-bimodule and, conversely, every reflexive masa-bimodule is of this form, for some ω-closed set κ [4]. Given a weak* closed masa-bimodule $\mathcal{U}$, its *support* is the ω-closed set κ such that

$\mathrm{Ref}\,\mathcal{U} = \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa)$. Given an ω-closed $\kappa \subseteq X \times Y$, there exists a smallest (with respect to inclusion) weak* closed masa-bimodule $\mathcal{U}$ with support κ [2], [20]; we denote this minimal masa-bimodule by $\mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\kappa)$. We will often use the fact that if κ_1 and κ_2 are ω-closed sets with $\kappa_1 \subseteq \kappa_2$ then $\mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa_1) \subseteq \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa_2)$ (this follows from the definition of $\mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa)$) and $\mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\kappa_1) \subseteq \mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\kappa_2)$ (this follows from [20, Theorem 3.3]).

Recall that the projective tensor product $\Gamma(X,Y) \overset{def}{=} L^2(X,m)\hat{\otimes}L^2(Y,n)$, whose norm will be denoted by $\|\cdot\|_\Gamma$, can be canonically identified with the predual of $\mathcal{B}(H_1,H_2)$. Each element $h \in \Gamma(X,Y)$ can be associated with a series (convergent with respect to $\|\cdot\|_\Gamma$) $h \sim \sum_{i=1}^\infty f_i \otimes g_i$, where $\sum_{i=1}^\infty \|f_i\|_2^2 < \infty$ and $\sum_{i=1}^\infty \|g_i\|_2^2 < \infty$; we have that $\langle T,h\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^\infty (Tf_i, \overline{g_i})$. It follows [2] that h can be identified with a complex function on $X \times Y$, defined up to a marginally null set, and given by $h(x,y) = \sum_{i=1}^\infty f_i(x)g_i(y)$. A function $\varphi \in L^\infty(X \times Y, m \times n)$ is called a *Schur multiplier* if φh is equivalent (with respect to the product measure) to a function from $\Gamma(X,Y)$ for every $h \in \Gamma(X,Y)$ (this definition is equivalent to other definitions used in the literature, see [17]). The Closed Graph Theorem implies that pointwise multiplication by a Schur multiplier φ is bounded, and by taking its dual, we obtain a bounded map S_φ on $\mathcal{B}(H_1,H_2)$, which we call a *Schur map.* It is standard to verify that S_φ is a masa-bimodule map in the sense that $S_\varphi(BTA) = BS_\varphi(T)A$, for all $T \in \mathcal{B}(H_1,H_2)$, $A \in \mathcal{D}_1$ and $B \in \mathcal{D}_2$. Indeed, we have the following well-known fact, which follows from results of U. Haagerup [8] and R. R. Smith [22].

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\Phi \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{B}(H_1,H_2))$. The following are equivalent:*

(i) Φ is a bounded weak continuous masa-bimodule map;*

(ii) Φ is a completely bounded weak continuous masa-bimodule map;*

(iii) $\Phi = S_\varphi$ for some Schur multiplier φ;

(iv) there exists a bounded column operator $(A_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ with entries in $\mathcal{D}_1$ and a bounded row operator $(B_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ with entries in $\mathcal{D}_2$ such that $\Phi(T) = \sum_{i=1}^\infty B_iTA_i$, $T \in \mathcal{B}(H_1,H_2)$ (the series being weak convergent).*

The Schur multiplier φ associated with a Schur map Φ in (iii) is uniquely determined by Φ and called its symbol [11]. We let $\mathfrak{I}$ be the set of all idempotent Schur maps (which we will call *Schur idempotents*). It was shown in [11] that the symbols of the maps from $\mathfrak{I}$ are characteristic functions of subsets of $X \times Y$ that are both ω-closed and ω-open. If φ and ψ are Schur multipliers, one easily checks that $S_\varphi S_\psi = S_{\varphi\psi}$; it follows that $\mathfrak{I}$ is a Boolean algebra of pairwise commuting idempotents in the sense of Section 2.

Remark Recall that an operator space $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(H_1,H_2)$ is called *injective* if for every pair of operator spaces $\mathcal{U}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{U}_2$, every completely bounded map $\Phi_1 : \mathcal{U}_1 \to \mathcal{U}$ has a completely bounded extension Φ_2 to $\mathcal{U}_2$ with $\|\Phi_1\|_{cb} = \|\Phi_2\|_{cb}$ [16]. It follows from paragraph 1.6.1 of [3] that every approximately $\mathfrak{I}$-injective masa-bimodule is the range of a completely bounded (not necessarily weak* continuous) idempotent. Hence, Arveson's Extension

Theorem implies that every approximately $\mathfrak{I}$-injective masa-bimodule has an extension property for completely bounded maps, not necessarily with preservation of the completely bounded norm.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(H_2, H_1)$ be a weak* closed subspace. The following are equivalent:*

(i) $\mathcal{U}$ is a masa-bimodule;

(ii) $\mathcal{U}$ is invariant under all Schur maps;

(iii) $\mathcal{U}$ is $\mathfrak{I}$-invariant.

Proof. (i)⇒(ii) Since $\mathcal{U}$ is a masa-bimodule, $ATB \in \mathcal{U}$ whenever $A \in \mathcal{D}_1$, $B \in \mathcal{D}_2$ and $T \in \mathcal{U}$. Since $\mathcal{U}$ is weak* closed, condition (iv) of Theorem 3.1 implies that $\mathcal{U}$ is invariant under all Schur maps.

(ii)⇒(iii) is trivial.

(iii)⇒(i) Let E (resp. F) be a projection in $\mathcal{D}_1$ (resp. $\mathcal{D}_2$). Then the map given by $\Phi(T) = FTE$, $T \in \mathcal{B}(H_1, H_2)$, clearly belongs to $\mathfrak{I}$. Thus, $F\mathcal{U}E \subseteq \mathcal{U}$. Since every von Neumann algebra is generated by its projections in the norm topology, we conclude that $B\mathcal{U}A \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ for all $A \in \mathcal{D}_1$ and $B \in \mathcal{D}_2$. □

Proposition 3.3. *(i) Every $\mathfrak{I}$-injective masa-bimodule is reflexive and is generated as a weak* closed subspace by the rank one operators it contains.*

(ii) A weak closed masa-bimodule is reflexive if and only if it is $\mathfrak{I}$-reflexive.*

Proof. (i) Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a $\mathfrak{I}$-injective masa-bimodule. Then there exists a subset $\kappa \subseteq X \times Y$ that is both ω-closed and ω-open such that $\mathcal{U} = \operatorname{Ran} S_{\chi_\kappa}$. It is easy to see (or, alternatively, it follows from Proposition 2.2 (iv)) that $\mathcal{U}$ is weak* closed. By [11, Proposition 12], $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa)$. Applying the same argument to $S_{\chi_\kappa}^\perp = S_{\chi_{\kappa^c}}$, we obtain $\operatorname{Ran} S_{\chi_\kappa}^\perp \subseteq \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa^c)$. It follows that

$$\mathcal{B}(H_1, H_2) = \operatorname{Ran} S_{\chi_\kappa} + \operatorname{Ran} S_{\chi_\kappa}^\perp \subseteq \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa) + \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa^c) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(H_1, H_2)$$

and hence equality holds throughout. Since the sums are direct, a simple linear algebra argument shows that $\operatorname{Ran} S_{\chi_\kappa} = \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa)$ and hence $\mathcal{U}$ is reflexive.

Assume that $\kappa = \cup_{i=1}^\infty \alpha_i \times \beta_i$, where $\alpha_i \subseteq X$, $\beta_i \subseteq Y$ are measurable. By [4, Lemma 3.4], for each $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist sets $X_N \subseteq X$ and $Y_N \subseteq Y$ such that $m(X \setminus X_N) < \frac{1}{N}$ and $n(Y \setminus Y_N) < \frac{1}{N}$ and $\kappa \cap (X_N \times Y_N)$ is contained in the union of finitely many of the sets $\alpha_i \times \beta_i$. Since a finite union of Borel rectangles is the finite union of disjoint Borel rectangles and $\mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\alpha \times \beta) = \mathcal{B}(M_{\chi_\alpha} H_1, M_{\chi_\beta} H_2)$, we have that $\mathfrak{M}_{\max}((X_N \times Y_N) \cap \kappa)$ is the weak* closure of the linear span of its rank one operators. Now let $T \in \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa)$ be arbitrary. Then $T = \text{w*-}\lim_{N \to \infty} F_N T E_N$, where E_N (resp. F_N) is the projection of multiplication by χ_{X_N} (resp. χ_{Y_N}). Moreover, $F_N T E_N \in \mathfrak{M}_{\max}((X_N \times Y_N) \cap \kappa)$, and the claim follows.

(ii) Let $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(H_1, H_2)$ be a weak* closed masa-bimodule. By [20], $\operatorname{Ref} \mathcal{U}$ consists of all the operators $T \in \mathcal{B}(H_1, H_2)$ with $FTE = 0$ whenever $E \in \mathcal{D}_1$

and $F \in \mathcal{D}_2$ are projections with $F\mathcal{U}E = \{0\}$. We claim that

$$\operatorname{Ref}\mathcal{U} = \operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{J}}\mathcal{U}. \tag{2}$$

Suppose that $T \in \operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{J}}\mathcal{U}$ and let $E \in \mathcal{D}_1$ and $F \in \mathcal{D}_2$ be projections with $F\mathcal{U}E = \{0\}$. The mapping Φ on $\mathcal{B}(H_1, H_2)$ given by $\Phi(X) = FXE$ clearly belongs to $\mathfrak{J}$ and annihilates $\mathcal{U}$. By the definition of $\operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{J}}$, we have that $\Phi(T) = 0$, that is, $FTE = 0$. Thus, $T \in \operatorname{Ref}\mathcal{U}$.

Conversely, suppose that $T \in \operatorname{Ref}\mathcal{U}$ and that $\Phi \in \mathfrak{J}$ annihilates $\mathcal{U}$. By (i), $\ker\Phi = \operatorname{Ran}(\Phi^{\perp})$ is reflexive, and hence $\operatorname{Ref}\mathcal{U} \subseteq \ker\Phi$. Thus, $\Phi(T) = 0$ and so $T \in \operatorname{Ref}_{\mathfrak{J}}\mathcal{U}$. Equality (2) is now established and the conclusion is immediate from it. □

Theorems 2.5 and 2.10 now yield the following corollaries.

Corollary 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{V}$ be an approximately $\mathfrak{J}$-injective masa-bimodule and $\mathcal{U}$ be a weak* closed masa-bimodule. Then $\mathcal{U} + \mathcal{V}$ is weak* closed and $\operatorname{Ref}(\mathcal{U} + \mathcal{V}) = \operatorname{Ref}(\mathcal{U}) + \mathcal{V}$. In particular, if $\mathcal{U}$ is reflexive then $\mathcal{U} + \mathcal{V}$ is reflexive.*

Corollary 3.5. *Let $\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_k$ be $\mathfrak{J}$-decomposable masa-bimodules and $\mathcal{U}$ be a weak* closed masa-bimodule. Then*

$$\overline{\mathcal{U} + \cap_{j=1}^{k}\mathcal{V}_j}^{w^*} = \cap_{j=1}^{k}\overline{\mathcal{U} + \mathcal{V}_j}^{w^*}.$$

Moreover, if $\mathcal{U}$ is reflexive then $\overline{\mathcal{U} + \cap_{j=1}^{k}\mathcal{V}_j}^{w^*}$ is a reflexive masa-bimodule. In particular, if $\mathcal{U}$ is reflexive then $\overline{\mathcal{U} + \mathcal{V}_1}^{w^*}$ is reflexive.

The example that follow show some particular instances where Corollaries 3.4 and 3.5 can be applied.

Examples (i) We recall [24] that a weak* closed masa-bimodule $\mathcal{M}$ is called *ternary* if $\mathcal{M}$ is a TRO, that is, if $TS^*R \in \mathcal{M}$ whenever $T, S, R \in \mathcal{M}$ (see [3]). The class of ternary masa-bimodules includes all von Neumann algebras with abelian commutant. We claim that every weak* closed ternary masa-bimodule $\mathcal{M}$ is approximately $\mathfrak{J}$-injective. To see this, note first that one may assume that $\mathcal{M}H_1$ is dense in H_2 and $\mathcal{M}^*H_2$ is dense in H_1, for otherwise we can replace the spaces H_1 and H_2 by $H_2^0 = \overline{\mathcal{M}H_1}$ and $H_1^0 = \overline{\mathcal{M}^*H_2}$, respectively. Set $\mathcal{C}_1 = (\mathcal{M}^*\mathcal{M})'$ and $\mathcal{C}_2 = (\mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}^*)'$. By [12], there exists a strongly continuous Boolean algebra isomorphism $\theta : \operatorname{Proj}(\mathcal{C}_1) \to \operatorname{Proj}(\mathcal{C}_2)$ (where by $\operatorname{Proj}(\mathcal{C})$ we denote the set of all orthogonal projections in $\mathcal{C}$) such that

$$\mathcal{M} = \{T \in \mathcal{B}(H, K) : TP = \theta(P)T,\ P \in \operatorname{Proj}(\mathcal{C}_1)\}.$$

Let $(P_k)_{k=1}^{\infty}$ be a strongly dense sequence in $\operatorname{Proj}(\mathcal{C}_1)$. Let $E_1, \dots, E_{m_n}$ be the atoms of the von Neumann algebra generated by $P_1, \dots, P_n$, $F_j = \theta(E_j)$, and $\mathcal{E}_n \in \mathfrak{J}$ be given by $\mathcal{E}_n(T) = \sum_j F_jTE_j$. Then $\|\mathcal{E}_n\| \leq 1$ for all n, $\operatorname{Ran}\mathcal{E}_{n+1} \subseteq \operatorname{Ran}\mathcal{E}_n$ and $\mathcal{M} = \cap_{n=1}^{\infty}\operatorname{Ran}\mathcal{E}_n$. Thus, $\mathcal{M}$ is approximately $\mathfrak{J}$-injective.

It follows that the class of approximately $\mathfrak{J}$-injective masa-bimodules is strictly larger than that of $\mathfrak{J}$-injective ones. Indeed, by the previous paragraph, a continuous masa is approximately $\mathfrak{I}$-injective, but it is not $\mathfrak{I}$-injective by a well-known result of Arveson's [1].

In Section 4 we will give an example of an approximately $\mathfrak{I}$-injective masa-bimodule for which the uniform bound on the norms of the corresponding idempotents cannot be chosen to be 1.

(ii) Recall that a nest is a totally ordered strongly closed set of projections on a Hilbert space, and that a nest algebra is the algebra of all operators leaving a given nest invariant. A nest algebra bimodule is a subspace $\mathcal{V}$ for which there exists nest algebras $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ with $\mathcal{B}\mathcal{V}\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$. We claim that every weak* closed nest algebra bimodule $\mathcal{V}$ is $\mathfrak{I}$-decomposable. To see this, write [5]

$$\mathcal{V} = \{S \in \mathcal{B}(H_1, H_2) : SN = \varphi(N)SN, \ N \in \mathcal{N}_1\},$$

for some nest $\mathcal{N}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{B}(H_1)$ and an increasing $\vee$-preserving map $\varphi : \mathcal{N}_1 \to \mathcal{N}_2$ ($\mathcal{N}_2$ being a nest on H_2). For every finite family $\mathcal{F}$ consisting of the elements $0 = N_1 < N_2 < \cdots < N_k = I$ of $\mathcal{N}$, let $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{F}}$ be given by $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{F}}(T) = \sum_{i=1}^{k}(\varphi(N_{i+1}) - \varphi(N_i))T(N_{i+1} - N_i)$ and let $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}$ be the range of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{F}}$. Let

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{F}} = \sum_{i<j}(\varphi(N_{i+1}) - \varphi(N_i))T(N_{j+1} - N_j).$$

Choose a (countable) strongly dense subset $\{N_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ of $\mathcal{N}_1$ such that the set $\{\varphi(N_i)\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is dense in $\mathcal{N}_2$, and let $\mathcal{P}_n = \{0, N_1, N_2, \ldots, N_n, I\}$. The conditions of Definition 2.6 are now readily verified for the sequences $(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P}_n})_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{P}_n})_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$.

It follows from the previous two paragraphs that the Volterra nest algebra $\mathcal{A}$ acting on $L^2(0,1)$ is an $\mathfrak{I}$-decomposable masa-bimodule. However, it is not approximately $\mathfrak{I}$-injective. To see this, assume the converse and note that, by Theorem 5.2 below, we have a direct sum decomposition $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2$ such that $\mathcal{A}_1$ is an injective masa-bimodule and $\mathcal{A}\cap\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_1$. However, $\mathcal{A}\cap\mathcal{K}$ is weak* dense in $\mathcal{A}$ (see, e.g. [6]) and it would follow that $\mathcal{A}$ is injective. Hence, the function χ_Δ where $\Delta = \{(x,y) \in [0,1] \times [0,1] : x \leq y\}$ would be a Schur multiplier on $\mathcal{B}(L^2(0,1))$, equivalently, the transformer of triangular truncation would be bounded, a contradiction.

The above examples and Corollaries 3.4 and 3.5 have the following consequences.

Corollary 3.6. *Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a weak* closed masa-bimodule and $\mathcal{M}$ be a weak* closed ternary masa-bimodule. Then $\mathcal{U}+\mathcal{M}$ is weak* closed. If $\mathcal{U}$ is reflexive then $\mathcal{U} + \mathcal{M}$ is reflexive.*

For the next corollary, we recall that a masa-bimodule of finite width is, by definition, the intersection of finitely many nest algebra bimodules.

Corollary 3.7. *Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a reflexive masa-bimodule and $\mathcal{V}$ be a masa-bimodule of finite width. Then $\overline{\mathcal{U} + \mathcal{V}}^{w^*}$ is reflexive. In particular, if $\mathcal{W}$ is a nest algebra bimodule then $\overline{\mathcal{U} + \mathcal{W}}^{w^*}$ is reflexive.*

4. Connections with operator synthesis

Let, as in Section 3, (X, m) and (Y, n) be standard measure spaces, $H_1 = L^2(X, m)$, $H_2 = L^2(Y, n)$ and $\mathcal{D}_1$ (resp. $\mathcal{D}_2$) be the multiplication masa of $L^\infty(X, m)$ (resp. $L^\infty(Y, n)$). We will denote by $\mathcal{K}$ (resp. $\mathcal{C}_2$) the ideal of all compact (resp. Hilbert-Schmidt) operators from H_1 into H_2. An ω-closed set $\kappa \subseteq X \times Y$ is called *operator synthetic* [2], [20] if $\mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\kappa) = \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa)$. A weak* closed masa-bimodule $\mathcal{U}$ will be called *synthetic* if the (unique up to marginal equivalence) ω-closed subset κ such that $\operatorname{Ref}\mathcal{U} = \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa)$ is operator synthetic.

For an ω-closed set $\kappa \subseteq X \times Y$, we let $\Psi_{\max}(\kappa) = \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa)_\perp$ and $\Psi_{\min}(\kappa) = \mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\kappa)_\perp$. We have that $\Psi_{\max}(\kappa)$ and $\Psi_{\min}(\kappa)$ are $\|\cdot\|_\Gamma$-closed subspaces of $\Gamma(X, Y)$, invariant under pointwise multiplication by Schur multipliers. We say that a function $h \in \Gamma(X, Y)$ vanishes on a subset $\kappa \subseteq X \times Y$ (and write "$h = 0$ on κ") if $h\chi_\kappa(x, y) = 0$ for marginally almost all (x, y). We have that [20],

$$\Psi_{\max}(\kappa) = \overline{\{h \in \Gamma(X, Y) : h = 0 \text{ on an } \omega\text{-open set containing } \kappa\}}^{\|\cdot\|_\Gamma}$$

and

$$\Psi_{\min}(\kappa) = \{h \in \Gamma(X, Y) : h = 0 \text{ on } \kappa\}.$$

By duality, a subset $\kappa \subseteq X \times Y$ is operator synthetic if and only if $\Psi_{\max}(\kappa) = \Psi_{\min}(\kappa)$. The set κ is called *strong operator Ditkin* [20] if there exists a sequence $(w_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of Schur multipliers, such that w_n vanishes on an ω-open set containing κ, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\|h - w_n h\|_\Gamma \to_{n\to\infty} 0$ for every $h \in \Psi_{\min}(\kappa)$.

The connection between Question 1.1 and the problem for the union of operator synthetic sets is summarised in the following proposition.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose that $\lambda \subseteq X \times Y$ is an operator synthetic ω-closed set such that $\overline{\mathcal{U} + \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\lambda)}^{w^*}$ is reflexive whenever $\mathcal{U}$ is a reflexive masa-bimodule. Then $\kappa \cup \lambda$ satisfies operator synthesis whenever κ does so.*

Proof. It is easy to see that for every ω-closed set κ, the support of $\mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa) + \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\lambda)$ is $\kappa \cup \lambda$. If κ satisfies operator synthesis then, using the fact that $\mathfrak{M}_{\min}$ is monotone, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa \cup \lambda) &= \overline{\mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa) + \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\lambda)}^{w^*} = \overline{\mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\kappa) + \mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\lambda)}^{w^*} \\ &\subseteq \mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\kappa \cup \lambda) \subseteq \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa \cup \lambda) \end{aligned}$$

and hence equality holds throughout. In particular, $\mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\kappa \cup \lambda) = \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa \cup \lambda)$, that is, $\kappa \cup \lambda$ is operator synthetic. □

We now discuss some consequences of Proposition 4.1 and the results from Section 3.

Sets of finite width. An ω-closed subset κ is the support of a nest algebra bimodule if and only if it is of the form

$$\kappa = \{(x, y) \in X \times Y : f(x) \leq g(y)\},$$

for some measurable functions $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$ and $g : Y \to \mathbb{R}$; see [23] (such sets will be called *nest sets*). It follows that the supports of masa-bimodules of finite width are precisely the sets of solutions of systems of inequalities of the form $f_i(x) \leq g_i(y)$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, for some measurable functions $f_i : X \to \mathbb{R}$ and $g_i : Y \to \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, \dots, k$ (call such sets *of finite width*). It was shown in [20] and [23] that sets of finite width are operator synthetic. Thus, Proposition 4.1 and Corollary 3.7 give the following extensions of this result.

Corollary 4.2. *The union of an operator synthetic set and a set of finite width is operator synthetic.*

Let G be a second countable locally compact group and $\omega : G \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be a continuous group homomorphism (where $\mathbb{R}^+$ is the multiplicative group of positive reals). We assume that the Fourier algebra $A(G)$ has a (perhaps unbounded) approximate identity (this assumption is satisfied by all amenable groups and is needed for the application of the results from [14]). For a subset $E \subseteq G$, write $E^* = \{(s,t) \in G \times G : st^{-1} \in E\}$. For each $t > 0$, let

$$E_\omega^t = \{x \in G : \omega(x) \leq t\}.$$

Then

$$(E_\omega^t)^* = \{(x,y) \in G \times G : \omega(x) \leq t\omega(y)\}$$

and hence $(E_\omega^t)^*$ is a nest set. The intersections of the form

$$E = E_{\omega_1}^{t_1} \cap \cdots \cap E_{\omega_k}^{t_k}$$

are Harmonic Analysis versions of sets of finite width; they have the property that corresponding set E^* is a set of finite width. By [14], a closed set E is synthetic if and only if the set E^* is operator synthetic (where G is equipped with left Haar measure). Corollary 4.2 thus has the following immediate consequence:

Corollary 4.3. *Let $F \subseteq G$ be a closed set satisfying spectral synthesis. Then $F \cup (E_{\omega_1}^{t_1} \cap \cdots \cap E_{\omega_k}^{t_k})$ satisfies spectral synthesis.*

Ternary sets. An ω-closed subset $\kappa \subseteq X \times Y$ is the support of a ternary masa-bimodule if and only if it is of the form

$$\kappa = \{(x,y) \in X \times Y : f(x) = g(y)\},$$

for some measurable functions $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$ and $g : Y \to \mathbb{R}$; see [19] and [12] (we call such sets *ternary*). Corollary 3.6 recovers (with a different proof) the following fact, which follows from [20, Theorem 7.1] and [14, Proposition 5.1].

Corollary 4.4. *The union of an operator synthetic set and a ternary set is operator synthetic.*

If κ is the support of an $\mathfrak{J}$-injective masa-bimodule, then Proposition 3.3 (i) shows that κ is operator synthetic. Indeed, all Hilbert-Schmidt operators in $\mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa)$ belong to $\mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\kappa)$ by [2], and it follows that $\mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa) = \mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\kappa)$.

We do not know whether the support of a $\mathfrak{J}$-decomposable masa-bimodule is necessarily operator synthetic. In the next theorem we show that whenever it is, it is as a matter of fact strong operator Ditkin.

Theorem 4.5. *Let κ be the support of an $\mathfrak{J}$-decomposable masa bimodule. Then κ is operator synthetic if and only if it is strong operator Ditkin.*

Proof. For a subset $E \subseteq X \times Y$, set

$$\gamma(E) = \inf\{m(\alpha) + n(\beta) : E \subseteq (\alpha \times Y) \cup (X \times \beta),\ \alpha, \beta \text{ measurable}\}$$

(see R. Haydon and V.S. Shulman's paper [10] where this quantity was defined).

Let $\mathcal{V}$ be an $\mathfrak{J}$-decomposable masa-bimodule, $(\Phi_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of elements of $\mathfrak{J}$, $C > 0$ be a constant with $\|\Phi_n\| \leq C$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $(\mathcal{W}_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of $\mathfrak{J}$-injective masa-bimodules such that the conditions of Definition 2.6 are satisfied. Let $\kappa_n \subseteq X \times Y$ and $\sigma_n \subseteq X \times Y$ be ω-closed sets with $\operatorname{Ran}\Phi_n = \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa_n)$ and $\mathcal{W}_n = \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\sigma_n)$; by [11], κ_n and σ_n are also ω-open. Note that $\Phi_n = S_{\chi_{\kappa_n}}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $\kappa \subseteq X \times Y$ be the support of $\mathcal{V}$. By Proposition 2.3 (i) and (iii), $\operatorname{Ran}\Phi_n + \mathcal{W}_n$ is reflexive; since its support is easily seen to be equal to $\sigma_n \cup \kappa_n$, we have that $\operatorname{Ran}\Phi_n + \mathcal{W}_n = \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\sigma_n \cup \kappa_n)$. Conditions (b) and (c) of Definition 2.6 imply that, up to a marginally null set,

$$\sigma_n \subseteq \kappa \subseteq \sigma_n \cup \kappa_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We claim (without the assumption that κ is operator synthetic) that

$$\Psi_{\max}(\kappa) = \{h \in \Psi_{\min}(\kappa) : \|\chi_{\kappa_n} h\|_{\Gamma} \to 0\}. \tag{3}$$

If $\|\chi_{\kappa_n} h\|_{\Gamma} \to 0$ for some $h \in \Psi_{\min}(\kappa)$ then $h = \lim_{n\to\infty} \chi_{\kappa_n^c} h$ and the function $\chi_{\kappa_n^c} h$ vanishes on $\kappa \cup \kappa_n = \sigma_n \cup \kappa_n$, an ω-open neighbourhood of κ. This shows that $h \in \Psi_{\max}(\kappa)$.

Conversely, assume that $h \in \Psi_{\max}(\kappa)$. Given $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an ω-open set E containing κ and an element $h_0 \in \Gamma(X, Y)$ vanishing on E such that $\|h - h_0\|_{\Gamma} < \frac{\epsilon}{2C}$.

The sets $E^c \cap \kappa_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, are ω-closed. Suppose that $T_n \in \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(E^c \cap \kappa_n)$, $\|T_n\| \leq 1$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and that $T_n \to T$ in the weak operator topology. Since $T_n \in \operatorname{Ran}\Phi_n$, we have, by condition (d) of Definition 2.6, that $T \in \mathcal{V} = \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa)$. On the other hand, T clearly belongs to $\mathfrak{M}_{\max}(E^c)$ since the latter space is weakly closed and contains all operators T_n, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows that T is supported on $E^c \cap \kappa = \emptyset$, and hence $T = 0$. It follows from [9, Proposition 3.5] that $\gamma(E^c \cap \kappa_n) \to 0$. Hence we can choose measurable subsets $\alpha_n \subseteq X$ and $\beta_n \subseteq Y$ such that

$$E^c \cap \kappa_n \subseteq (\alpha_n \times Y) \cup (X \times \beta_n) \text{ and } \lim_{n\to\infty} m(\alpha_n) = \lim_{n\to\infty} n(\beta_n) = 0.$$

Set $E_n = \alpha_n \times Y$ and $F_n = \alpha_n^c \times \beta_n$. We claim that

$$\|\chi_{\kappa_n} h_0\|_\Gamma \leq C\|\chi_{E_n} h_0\|_\Gamma + C\|\chi_{F_n} h_0\|_\Gamma. \tag{4}$$

To see this, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\chi_{\kappa_n} h_0\|_\Gamma &= \sup\{|\langle \chi_{\kappa_n \cap E^c} h_0, T\rangle| : \|T\| \leq 1\} \\
&= \sup\{|\langle \chi_{\kappa_n \cap E^c} \chi_{E_n \cup F_n} h_0, T\rangle| : \|T\| \leq 1\} \\
&= \sup\{|\langle \chi_{\kappa_n} h_0, S_{\chi_{E_n \cup F_n}}(T)\rangle| : \|T\| \leq 1\} \\
&= \sup\{|\langle h_0, S_{\chi_{\kappa_n} \chi_{E_n \cup F_n}}(T)\rangle| : \|T\| \leq 1\} \\
&= \sup\{|\langle h_0, S_{\chi_{E_n \cup F_n}}(S_{\chi_{\kappa_n}}(T))\rangle| : \|T\| \leq 1\} \\
&\leq C \sup\{|\langle h_0, S_{\chi_{E_n \cup F_n}}(T)\rangle| : \|T\| \leq 1\} \\
&\leq C \sup\{|\langle h_0, S_{\chi_{E_n}}(T)\rangle| : \|T\| \leq 1\} \\
&+ C \sup\{|\langle h_0, S_{\chi_{F_n}}(T)\rangle| : \|T\| \leq 1\} \\
&= C \sup\{|\langle \chi_{E_n} h_0, T\rangle| : \|T\| \leq 1\} \\
&+ C \sup\{|\langle \chi_{F_n} h_0, T\rangle| : \|T\| \leq 1\} \\
&= C\|\chi_{E_n} h_0\|_\Gamma + C\|\chi_{F_n} h_0\|_\Gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, (4) is established.

We claim that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|\chi_{E_n} h_0\|_\Gamma = \lim_{n\to\infty} \|\chi_{F_n} h_0\|_\Gamma = 0. \tag{5}$$

To see this, write $h_0 = \sum_{i=1}^\infty f_i \otimes g_i \in \Gamma(X, Y)$ with $\sum_{i=1}^\infty \|f_i\|_2^2 < \infty$ and $\sum_{i=1}^\infty \|g_i\|_2^2 < \infty$. Observe that

$$\int_X \left(\sum_{i=1}^\infty |f_i|^2\right) dm = \sum_{i=1}^\infty \|f_i\|_2^2 < \infty,$$

that is, $\sum_{i=1}^\infty |f_i|^2 \in L^1(X, m)$. Since $\chi_{E_n} h = \sum_{i=1}^\infty (\chi_{\alpha_n} f_i) \otimes g_i$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\chi_{E_n} h_0\|_\Gamma^2 &\leq \sum_{i=1}^\infty \|\chi_{\alpha_n} f_i\|_2^2 \sum_{i=1}^\infty \|g_i\|_2^2 \\
&= \left(\sum_{i=1}^\infty \|g_i\|_2^2\right) \int_{\alpha_n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^\infty |f_i|^2\right) dm \longrightarrow_{n\to\infty} 0
\end{aligned}$$

since $m(\alpha_n) \to 0$. Similarly we show that $\|\chi_{F_n} h_0\|_\Gamma \to 0$ and hence (5) is established. Inequality (4) now implies that $\|\chi_{E^c \cap \kappa_n} h_0\|_\Gamma \to 0$. Choosing n_0 such that $\|\chi_{E^c \cap \kappa_n} h_0\|_\Gamma < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ for $n \geq n_0$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\chi_{\kappa_n} h\|_\Gamma &\leq \|\chi_{\kappa_n}(h - h_0)\|_\Gamma + \|\chi_{\kappa_n} h_0\|_\Gamma \\
&= \|\chi_{\kappa_n}(h - h_0)\|_\Gamma + \|\chi_{E^c \cap \kappa_n} h_0\|_\Gamma < \epsilon
\end{aligned}$$

whenever $n \geq n_0$, which establishes (3).

Now suppose that κ is an operator synthetic set and let $h \in \Psi_{\min}(\kappa)$. We have that

$$h = \chi_{\kappa_n} h + \chi_{\sigma_n \cap \kappa_n^c} h + \chi_{(\kappa_n \cup \sigma_n)^c} h.$$

Since h vanishes on κ and $\sigma_n \subseteq \kappa$, we have that $\chi_{\sigma_n \cap \kappa_n^c} h = 0$. On the other hand, (3) implies that $\|\chi_{\kappa_n} h\|_\Gamma \to_{n\to\infty} 0$. It follows that $\|h - \chi_{(\kappa_n \cup \sigma_n)^c} h\|_\Gamma \to_{n\to\infty} 0$. However, $\chi_{(\kappa_n \cup \sigma_n)^c}$ is a Schur multiplier vanishing on the ω-open neighbourhood $\kappa_n \cup \sigma_n$ of κ. It follows that κ is strong operator Ditkin. □

Since nest algebra bimodules are $\mathfrak{J}$-decomposable, Theorem 4.5 yields the following immediate corollary.

Corollary 4.6. *Every nest set is strong operator Ditkin.*

Theorem 4.5 also implies the following fact obtained in [14].

Corollary 4.7. *Every ternary set is strong operator Ditkin.*

5. The structure of approximately $\mathfrak{J}$-injective masa-bimodules

In this section, we develop some further operator synthetic properties of approximately $\mathfrak{J}$-injective masa-bimodules. We do not know whether the supports of such masa-bimodules are operator synthetic. However, we show in Theorem 5.2 below that $\mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa)$ and $\mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\kappa)$ contain the same compact operators. Our first aim is to establish a structure result for approximately $\mathfrak{J}$-injective masa-bimodules (Theorem 5.2). We recall that $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}(H_1, H_2)$ is the set of compact operators and $\mathcal{C}_2 = \mathcal{C}_2(H_1, H_2)$ is the Hilbert-Schmidt operator ideal; we denote the Hilbert-Schmidt norm by $\|\cdot\|_2$.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $(\mathcal{E}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a uniformly bounded sequence of Schur idempotents such that* $\operatorname{Ran}\mathcal{E}_{n+1} \subseteq \operatorname{Ran}\mathcal{E}_n$*, $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

(i) If $K \in \mathcal{C}_2$ the sequence $(\mathcal{E}_n(K))_n$ converges in the Hilbert-Schmidt norm.

(ii) If $K \in \mathcal{K}$ the sequence $(\mathcal{E}_n(K))_n$ converges in the operator norm.

Proof. (i) Suppose that $\kappa_n \subseteq X \times Y$ is an ω-closed set with $\mathcal{E}_n = S_{\chi_{\kappa_n}}$. It is easy to see that if T_φ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator with integral kernel $\varphi \in L^2(X \times Y, m \times n)$ then $\mathcal{E}_n(T_\varphi) = T_{\chi_{\kappa_n}\varphi}$. It follows that the sequence $(\mathcal{E}_n|_{\mathcal{C}_2})_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a decreasing sequence of orthogonal projections on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{C}_2$. It follows that the sequence $(\mathcal{E}_n(T_\varphi))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges in the Hilbert-Schmidt norm for all $\varphi \in L^2(X \times Y)$.

(ii) Let $K \in \mathcal{K}$ and $\epsilon > 0$. There exists $L \in \mathcal{C}_2$ such that $\|K - L\| < \frac{\epsilon}{3C}$. By (i), the sequence $(\mathcal{E}_n(L))_n$ converges in $\|\cdot\|_2$ norm, so there exists n_0 such that

$$\|\mathcal{E}_n(L) - \mathcal{E}_m(L)\|_2 < \epsilon/3, \quad n, m \geq n_0.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\mathcal{E}_n(K)-\mathcal{E}_m(K)\|\\ \leq&\|\mathcal{E}_n(K)-\mathcal{E}_n(L)\|+\|\mathcal{E}_n(L)-\mathcal{E}_m(L)\|+\|\mathcal{E}_m(L)-\mathcal{E}_m(K)\|\\ \leq&C\|K-L\|+\|\mathcal{E}_n(L)-\mathcal{E}_m(L)\|_2+C\|L-K\|<\epsilon,\end{aligned}$$

for all $n,m\geq n_0$, and the sequence $(\mathcal{E}_n(K))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges in the operator norm. □

In some of the results that follow, we will use the notion of a pseudo-integral operator introduced by W. B. Arveson in [2]. Let $\mathbb{A}(X,Y)=\mathbb{A}(X,Y,m,n)$ be the space of Borel measures μ on $Y\times X$ of finite total variation for which there exists a constant $c>0$ such that

$$|\mu|_X\leq cm \ \text{ and } \ |\mu|_Y\leq cn,$$

where $|\mu|$ is the variation of μ and, for a measure ν on $Y\times X$, we denote by ν_X (resp. ν_Y) the marginal measure on X (resp. Y) given by $\nu_X(\alpha)=\nu(Y\times\alpha)$ (resp. $\nu_Y(\beta)=\nu(\beta\times X)$). We denote the smallest constant $c>0$ with these properties by $\|\mu\|$. To every $\mu\in\mathbb{A}(X,Y)$, there corresponds an operator T_μ satisfying

$$\langle T_\mu f,g\rangle=\int_{\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y}}f(x)\overline{g(y)}d\mu(y,x),\qquad f\in H_1,g\in H_2.$$

The operator T_μ is called the *pseudo-integral operator* associated with the measure μ. Moreover [25], if $\kappa\subseteq X\times Y$ is an ω-closed set and $\hat{\kappa}=\{(y,x)\in Y\times X:(x,y)\in\kappa\}$, then

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\kappa)=\overline{\{T_\mu:\mu\text{ is supported on }\hat{\kappa}\}}^{w^*}. \tag{6}$$

Theorem 5.2. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an approximately $\mathfrak{I}$-injective masa-bimodule, and $\kappa\subseteq X\times Y$ be the ω-closed set with $\mathcal{M}=\mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa)$. There exist an $\mathfrak{I}$-injective masa-bimodule $\mathcal{M}_{\rm inj}$ and an approximately $\mathfrak{I}$-injective masa-bimodule $\mathcal{M}_{\rm pai}$ such that*

- (a) *we have a direct sum decomposition $\mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa)=\mathcal{M}_{\rm inj}+\mathcal{M}_{\rm pai}$,*
- (b) *$\mathcal{M}_{\rm inj}=\overline{\mathcal{M}\cap\mathcal{K}}^{w^*}$, and*
- (c) *$\mathcal{M}_{\rm pai}$ contains no non-zero compact operators.*

Moreover, $\mathcal{M}_{\rm inj}$ is the maximal $\mathfrak{I}$-injective masa-bimodule contained in $\mathcal{M}$ and

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\kappa)\cap\mathcal{K}=\mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa)\cap\mathcal{K}=\overline{\mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa)\cap\mathcal{C}_2}^{\|\cdot\|}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 5.1 (ii), the limit $\Phi(K)=\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathcal{E}_n(K)$ exists for every $K\in\mathcal{K}$. The mapping $\Phi:\mathcal{K}\to\mathcal{K}$ is clearly linear and, since the mappings $\mathcal{E}_n$ are uniformly bounded, it is bounded. It is also a masa-bimodule idempotent since the $\mathcal{E}_n$'s are such. Passing to the second dual, we obtain an extension (denoted in the same way) $\Phi:\mathcal{B}(H_1,H_2)\to\mathcal{B}(H_1,H_2)$ which is a Schur idempotent. By paragraph 1.6.1 of [3], there exists a bounded (not necessarily weak* continuous) idempotent $\mathcal{E}$ such that $\operatorname{Ran}\mathcal{E}=\mathcal{M}$. Set

$\mathcal{M}_{\rm inj} = \operatorname{Ran}\Phi$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\rm pai} = \operatorname{Ran}\Phi^{\perp}\mathcal{E}$. Since $\mathcal{E} = \Phi\mathcal{E} + \Phi^{\perp}\mathcal{E} = \Phi + \Phi^{\perp}\mathcal{E}$, we have a direct sum decomposition $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_{\rm inj} + \mathcal{M}_{\rm pai}$. If $K \in \mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{K}$ then $\mathcal{E}_n(K) = K$ for all K and hence $K = \Phi(K) \in \mathcal{M}_{\rm inj}$. Conversely, if $T \in \mathcal{M}_{\rm inj}$, let $T =$w*-lim K_i, for some net (K_i) of compact operators. But then $T =$w*-lim $\Phi(K_i) \in \mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{K}$, and (b) follows. Finally, if $K \in \mathcal{M}_{\rm pai} \cap \mathcal{K}$ then $K = \Phi^{\perp}\mathcal{E}(K) = \mathcal{E}\Phi^{\perp}(K) = 0$, and (c) follows.

Suppose that $\mathcal{M}_0$ is an $\mathfrak{I}$-injective masa-bimodule contained in $\mathcal{M}$. By (b) and Proposition 3.3 (i),

$$\mathcal{M}_0 \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}_0 \cap \mathcal{K}}^{w^*} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{K}}^{w^*} = \mathcal{M}_{\rm inj},$$

hence $\mathcal{M}_{\rm inj}$ is a maximal $\mathfrak{I}$-injective masa-bimodule contained in $\mathcal{M}$.

The inclusion $\mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\kappa) \cap \mathcal{K} = \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa) \cap \mathcal{K}$ is trivial, while the inclusion $\mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa) \cap \mathcal{K} = \overline{\mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa) \cap \mathcal{C}_2}^{\|\cdot\|}$ follows from Proposition 3.3 (i). Suppose that $K \in \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa) \cap \mathcal{C}_2$; then K is a pseudo-integral operator [2] and hence, by (6), belongs to $\mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\kappa) \cap \mathcal{K}$. Since the latter space is norm closed, the equalities follow. □

Remarks (i) The subscript of $\mathcal{M}_{\rm pai}$ stands for "purely approximately $\mathfrak{I}$-injective". Note that $\mathcal{M}_{\rm pai}$ does not contain a non-zero $\mathfrak{I}$-injective masa-bimodule. Examples of such masa-bimodules include the ternary masa-bimodules containing no non-zero rank one operators, in particular continuous masas.

(ii) It follows from Theorem 5.2 that an approximately $\mathfrak{I}$-injective masa-bimodule $\mathcal{M}$ is injective if and only if $\overline{\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{K}}^{w^*} = \mathcal{M}$. Indeed, one direction follows from Proposition 3.3 (i); to see the other, assume that $\overline{\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{K}}^{w^*} = \mathcal{M}$ and let $\mathcal{K} \ni K_n \to_{w^*} T \in \mathcal{M}_{\rm pai}$. Letting Φ be the Schur idempotent with range $\mathcal{M}_{\rm inj}$, we have $\Phi^{\perp}(K_n) \to T$. However, $\Phi^{\perp}(K_n) \in \mathcal{K} \cap \mathcal{M}_{\rm pai} = \{0\}$, and hence $T = 0$.

(iii) We note that $\mathfrak{I}$-decomposable masa-bimodules do not in general contain a maximal $\mathfrak{I}$-injective masa-bimodule. For an example, let $\mathcal{A}$ be the Volterra nest algebra acting on $L^2(0,1)$. Then $\mathcal{A} = \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\Delta)$, where $\Delta = \{(x,y) \in [0,1] \times [0,1] : x \leq y\}$. Let $\Delta_0 = \{(x,y) \in [0,1] \times [0,1] : x < y\}$; then Δ_0 is an ω-open set which contains every measurable rectangle $\alpha \times \beta$ marginally contained in Δ. Suppose that $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ is an $\mathfrak{I}$-injective masa-bimodule, say $\mathcal{M} = \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa)$, for some ω-open and ω-closed set $\kappa \subseteq [0,1] \times [0,1]$. It follows that, up to marginal equivalence, $\kappa \subseteq \Delta_0$. Moreover, κ is not marginally equivalent to Δ_0 since Δ_0 is not ω-closed. But then $\kappa^c \cap \Delta_0$ is a non-marginally null ω-open set and therefore contains a measurable rectangle $\alpha \times \beta$. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{M} + \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\alpha \times \beta)$ is an $\mathfrak{I}$-injective masa-bimodule; clearly, it contains properly $\mathcal{M}$. We thus showed that $\mathcal{A}$ does not contain a maximal $\mathfrak{I}$-injective masa-bimodule.

Example We present an example of an approximately $\mathfrak{I}$-injective, but not $\mathfrak{I}$-injective, masa bimodule $\mathcal{U}$, for which the uniform bound for the norms of any sequence of Schur idempotents with decreasing ranges whose intersection is $\mathcal{U}$ can not be chosen to be smaller than $\frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}$. Let $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ be weak* closed ternary masa-bimodules, and let $(\Phi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ (resp. $(\Psi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$) be a sequence of Schur idempotents of norm one with decreasing ranges such that $\cap \operatorname{Ran}\Phi_n = \mathcal{M}$ (resp. $\cap \operatorname{Ran}\Psi_n = \mathcal{N}$). Let $\Theta_n = \Phi_n + \Psi_n - \Phi_n\Psi_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then Θ_n is a Schur idempotent with $\|\Theta_n\| \leq 2$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We claim that $\cap \operatorname{Ran}\Theta_n = \mathcal{M} + \mathcal{N}$. Indeed, write $\mathcal{M}_n = \operatorname{Ran}\Phi_n$, $\mathcal{N}_n = \operatorname{Ran}\Psi_n$ and suppose that $T \in \cap_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \operatorname{Ran}\Theta_n$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, write $T = X_n + Y_n$ with $X_n \in \mathcal{M}_n$ and $Y_n \in \mathcal{N}_n$. Choose a subsequence $(n_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\Phi_{n_k}(T) = X_{n_k} + \Phi_{n_k}(Y_{n_k})$ converge weak* along $k \in \mathbb{N}$ to an operator X. Clearly, $X \in \mathcal{M}$. Since $\mathcal{N}$ is invariant under Schur maps, $T - (X_{n_k} + \Phi_{n_k}(Y_{n_k})) = Y_{n_k} - \Phi_{n_k}(Y_{n_k})$ converge weak*, along $k \in \mathbb{N}$, to an operator Y in $\mathcal{N}$. Thus, $T = X + Y \in \mathcal{M} + \mathcal{N}$. We showed that $\cap_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \operatorname{Ran}\Theta_n \subseteq \mathcal{M}+\mathcal{N}$; the converse inclusion is trivial.

Now suppose additionally that $\mathcal{M}$ is $\mathfrak{I}$-injective while $\mathcal{N}$ is not, $\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{N} = \{0\}$, and $\mathcal{M} + \mathcal{N}$ is not a TRO (for example, let $H = L^2(0,1)$, P be the projection onto $L^2(0,\frac{1}{2})$, $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{B}(P(H)^{\perp}, P(H)))$ and $\mathcal{N}$ be the multiplication masa of $L^{\infty}(0,1)$). From the first paragraph, $\mathcal{M} + \mathcal{N}$ is an approximately $\mathfrak{I}$-injective masa-bimodule. Since $\mathcal{N}$ is not $\mathfrak{I}$-injective, it does not contain non-zero compact operators and we see that $\mathcal{M}$ is the $\mathfrak{I}$-injective part of $\mathcal{M} + \mathcal{N}$, while $\mathcal{N}$ is its purely approximately $\mathfrak{I}$-injective part. It follows that $\mathcal{M} + \mathcal{N}$ is not $\mathfrak{I}$-injective. We claim that for every sequence $(\mathcal{E}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of Schur idempotents with $\cap_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \operatorname{Ran}\mathcal{E}_n = \mathcal{M} + \mathcal{N}$, we have that $\|\mathcal{E}_n\| \geq \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}$ eventually. Indeed, if not then, by [11], $\operatorname{Ran}\mathcal{E}_n$ would be a TRO for infinitely many n, and hence $\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{N}$ would be a TRO, contradicting our assumption.

Since approximately $\mathfrak{I}$-injective masa-bimodules are $\mathfrak{I}$-decomposable, Theorem 4.5 implies that the support of an approximately $\mathfrak{I}$-injective masa-bimodule is operator synthetic if and only if it is strong operator Ditkin. In Theorem 5.5, we give a more precise statement for this special case. We need a couple of preliminary statements.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $w : X \times Y \to \mathbb{C}$ be a bounded measurable function and $\mu \in \mathbb{A}(X,Y)$. Then the measure $w\mu$ given by $w\mu(E) = \int_E w(x,y)d\mu(y,x)$ belongs to $\mathbb{A}(X,Y)$.*

Proof. For a measurable subset $E \subseteq Y \times X$ we have (the supremum being taken over all partitions $E = \cup_{i=1}^k E_i$)

$$\begin{aligned} |w\mu|(E) &= \sup \sum_{i=1}^{k} |w\mu(E_i)| = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left| \int_{E_i} w(x,y)d\mu(y,x) \right| \\ &\leq \|w\|_\infty \sum_{i=1}^{k} |\mu|(E_i) = \|w\|_\infty |\mu|(E). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $|w\mu| \leq \|w\|_\infty |\mu|$ and hence $|w\mu|_X \leq \|w\|_\infty |\mu|_X$ and $|w\mu|_Y \leq \|w\|_\infty |\mu|_Y$. Since $\mu \in \mathbb{A}(X,Y)$, we have that $w\mu \in \mathbb{A}(X,Y)$. $\square$

Proposition 5.4. *Let $\sigma \subseteq X \times Y$ be an operator synthetic set and $\kappa \subseteq X \times Y$ be an ω-closed set such that χ_κ is a Schur multiplier. Then $\sigma \cap \kappa$ is operator synthetic.*

Proof. Since χ_κ is a Schur multiplier, κ is ω-open [11]; assume, without loss of generality, that $\kappa = \cup_{i=1}^\infty \alpha_i \times \beta_i$, where $\alpha_i \subseteq X$ and $\beta_i \subseteq Y$ are measurable. As in the proof of Proposition 3.3 (i), let $(X_N)_{N\in\mathbb{N}}$ (resp. $(Y_N)_{N\in\mathbb{N}}$) be an increasing sequence of measurable subsets of X (resp. Y) such that $m(X \setminus X_N) < 1/N$, $n(Y \setminus Y_N) < 1/N$, and $\kappa_N \overset{def}{=} \kappa \cap (X_N \times Y_N)$ is contained in the union of finitely many of the sets $\alpha_i \times \beta_i$. Write $\kappa_N = \cup_{j=1}^{k_N} \gamma_j^N \times \delta_j^N$, as a disjoint union, where each $\gamma_j^N \times \beta_j^N$ is contained in some $\alpha_i \times \beta_i$. Let $h = f \otimes g \in \Gamma(X, Y)$ be an elementary tensor, where $f \in L^\infty(X, m)$ and $g \in L^\infty(Y, n)$. Then $\|h - (\chi_{X_N} f) \otimes (\chi_{Y_N} g)\|_\Gamma \to_{N\to\infty} 0$.

Let $\mu \in \mathbb{A}(X, Y)$. Then $\chi_{\kappa_N}(x, y) \to \chi_\kappa(x, y)$ for all $(x, y) \in (\cup_{N=1}^\infty X_N) \times (\cup_{N=1}^\infty Y_N)$. Since $((\cup_{N=1}^\infty X_N) \times (\cup_{N=1}^\infty Y_N))^c$ is marginally null, we have that it is μ-null, and hence $\chi_{\kappa_N}(x, y) \to \chi_\kappa(x, y)$ for μ-almost all $(x, y) \in X \times Y$. Using Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem and Lemma 5.3, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle S_{\chi_\kappa}(T_\mu), h\rangle &= \lim_{N\to\infty} \langle S_{\chi_\kappa}(T_\mu), (\chi_{X_N} f) \otimes (\chi_{Y_N} g)\rangle \\
&= \langle T_\mu, \chi_\kappa(\chi_{X_N} f) \otimes (\chi_{Y_N} g)\rangle = \langle T_\mu, \chi_{\kappa_N}(f \otimes g)\rangle \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{k_N} \langle T_\mu, (\chi_{\gamma_j^N} f) \otimes (\chi_{\delta_j^N} g)\rangle \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{k_N} \int_{\delta_j^N \times \gamma_j^N} g(y) f(x) d\mu(y, x) \\
&= \int_{Y\times X} \chi_{\kappa_N}(x, y) g(y) f(x) d\mu(y, x) \\
&\to \int_{Y\times X} \chi_\kappa(x, y) g(y) f(x) d\mu(y, x) \\
&= \langle T_{\chi_\kappa \mu}, h\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $S_{\chi_\kappa}(T_\mu) = T_{\chi_\kappa \mu}$.

Now let $T \in \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\sigma \cap \kappa)$. Since κ is operator synthetic, (6) implies that $T = \text{w}^*\text{-}\lim T_{\mu_\alpha}$, where $\mu_\alpha \in \mathbb{A}(X \times Y)$ are measures supported on $\hat{\sigma}$. Since the measure $\chi_\kappa \mu_\alpha$ is supported on $\hat{\sigma} \cap \hat{\kappa}$, we have that $T_{\chi_\kappa \mu_\alpha} = S_{\chi_\kappa}(T_{\mu_\alpha})$ is a pseudo-integral operator in $\mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\sigma \cap \kappa)$, Moreover, $T = S_{\chi_\kappa}(T) = \text{w}^*$-$\lim S_{\chi_\kappa}(T_{\mu_\alpha})$, and hence $T \in \mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\sigma \cap \kappa)$. Thus, $\mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\sigma \cap \kappa) = \mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\sigma \cap \kappa)$. □

Theorem 5.5. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an approximately $\mathfrak{I}$-injective masa-bimodule, $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_{\text{inj}} + \mathcal{M}_{\text{pai}}$ be the decomposition from Theorem 5.2, κ be the support of $\mathcal{M}$ and κ_{pai} be the support of $\mathcal{M}_{\text{pai}}$. The following are equivalent:*

(i) κ is operator synthetic;

(ii) κ *is strong operator Ditkin;*
(iii) $\kappa_{\rm pai}$ *is operator synthetic;*
(iv) $\kappa_{\rm pai}$ *is strong operator Ditkin.*

Proof. (i)⇔(ii) is a direct consequence of Theorem 4.5 and Remark (i) before Theorem 2.8.

The equivalence (iii)⇔(iv) follows from the equivalence (i)⇔(ii) upon noticing that $\kappa_{\rm pai}$ is the support of the approximately $\mathfrak{J}$-injective masa-bimodule $\Phi^{\perp}(\mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa))$, where Φ is the Schur idempotent with range $\mathcal{M}_{\rm inj}$.

(i)⇒(iii) Let $\kappa_{\rm inj}$ be the support of $\mathcal{M}_{\rm inj}$. By Proposition 5.4, $\kappa_{\rm pai} = \kappa \cap \kappa_{\rm inj}^c$ is operator synthetic.

(iii)⇒(i) Suppose that $T \in \mathcal{M}$. Then $T = T_1 + T_2$, where $T_1 \in \mathcal{M}_{\rm inj} = \mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\kappa_{\rm inj})$ and $T_2 \in \mathcal{M}_{\rm pai}$. Since $\kappa_{\rm pai}$ is synthetic, $T_2 \in \mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\kappa_{\rm pai})$, and hence $T_1 + T_2 \in \mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\kappa)$. □

We finish this section with another structure result.

Proposition 5.6. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an approximately $\mathfrak{J}$-injective masa-bimodule and $(\mathcal{E}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be an associated sequence of Schur idempotents. Let κ be the support of $\mathcal{M}$ and κ_n be the support of* $\operatorname{Ran}\mathcal{E}_n$*, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. There exists pseudo-integral operator $T \in \mathcal{B}(H_1, H_2)$ such that the limit $S \overset{def}{=} \|\cdot\|\text{-}\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{E}_n(T)$ exists and*

$$\mathcal{B}(H_1,H_2) = \overline{[\mathcal{D}_2 T \mathcal{D}_1]}^{w^*}, \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa_n) = \overline{[\mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{E}_n(T) \mathcal{D}_1]}^{w^*}, \mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\kappa) = \overline{[\mathcal{D}_2 S \mathcal{D}_1]}^{w^*}.$$

Proof. After a suitable unitary equivalence, we may assume that $m(X) = n(Y) = 1$. Write $\text{Ball}(\mathcal{B}(H_1,H_2))$ for the unit ball of $\mathcal{B}(H_1,H_2)$. Suppose that

$$\text{Ball}(\mathcal{B}(H_1,H_2)) = \overline{\{T_{\phi_k} : k \in \mathbb{N}\}}^{w^*}$$

where T_{ϕ_k} is the Hilbert Schmidt operator with integral kernel $\phi_k \in L^2(X \times Y)$ and

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\kappa) = \overline{\{T_{\mu_k} : k \in \mathbb{N}\}}^{w^*}$$

where the measures $\mu_k \in \mathbb{A}(X,Y)$ are supported on $\hat{\kappa}$. We define

$$\phi = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \frac{|\phi_n|}{\|\phi_n\|_2} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \frac{|\mu_n|}{\|\mu_n\|}.$$

It is readily checked that μ is a positive measure in $\mathbb{A}(X,Y)$ with $\mu(Y \times X) \leq 1$ and $\|\mu\| \leq 1$. By Lemma 5.1 (ii), there exists an operator $X \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $\|\cdot\|\text{-}\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{E}_n(T_\phi) = X$. Thus,

$$\|\cdot\|\text{-}\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{E}_n(T_\mu + T_\phi) = T_\mu + X = S.$$

We write $T = T_\mu + T_\phi$. Let $\alpha \subseteq X$, $\beta \subseteq Y$ be measurable subsets such that $P(\beta) T P(\alpha) = 0$. It follows that if $\xi \in H_1, \eta \in H_2$ are non-negative functions then

$$\int_{\alpha\times\beta} \phi(x,y)\xi(x)\eta(y) dm \times n + \int_{\alpha\times\beta} \xi(x)\eta(y) d\mu = 0.$$

Since $\phi \geq 0$ and $\mu \geq 0$ we have that

$$\int_{\alpha \times \beta} \phi_k(x,y)\xi(x)\omega(y) dm \times n = 0, \quad \forall \ k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We conclude that $\langle P(\beta)T_{\phi_k}P(\alpha)\xi, \eta\rangle = 0$ and hence $\langle P(\beta)AP(\alpha)\xi,\eta\rangle = 0$, for all $A \in \mathcal{B}(H_1, H_2)$. Since ξ and η where arbitrary non-negative functions, we have that $P(\beta)AP(\alpha) = 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{B}(H_1, H_2)$. We thus proved that the reflexive hull of the space $[\mathcal{D}_2 T \mathcal{D}_1]$ is $\mathcal{B}(H_1, H_2)$. Since $\mathcal{B}(H_1, H_2)$ is synthetic, it follows that $\mathcal{B}(H_1, H_2) = \overline{[\mathcal{D}_2 T \mathcal{D}_1]}^{w^*}$. Similarly, if ξ, η are arbitrary non-negative functions such that $\langle P(\beta)SP(\alpha)\xi, \eta\rangle = 0$ then

$$\langle P(\beta)T_\mu P(\alpha)\xi, \eta\rangle + \langle P(\beta)XP(\alpha)\xi, \eta\rangle = 0.$$

Since $\langle X\xi', \eta'\rangle \geq 0$ for all non-negative functions ξ', η', we have that

$$\langle P(\beta)T_\mu P(\alpha)\xi, \eta\rangle = 0,$$

and so

$$\langle P(\beta)AP(\alpha)\xi, \eta\rangle = 0, \quad \text{for all } A \in \mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\kappa).$$

It follows that $\operatorname{Ref}(\mathcal{D}_2 S \mathcal{D}_1) = \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa)$ and since S is a pseudo-integral operator, we conclude that $\mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\kappa) = \overline{[\mathcal{D}_2 S \mathcal{D}_1]}^{w^*}$. □

6. Converse results

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an approximately $\mathfrak{I}$-injective $\mathcal{D}_2, \mathcal{D}_1$-bimodule, $\mathcal{U}$ be a weak* closed $\mathcal{D}_2, \mathcal{D}_1$-bimodule and $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{U} + \mathcal{M}$. By Corollary 3.4, $\mathcal{W}$ is a weak* closed masa-bimodule. Moreover, by Corollary 3.4 and Proposition 4.1, $\mathcal{W}$ is reflexive (resp. synthetic) if $\mathcal{U}$ is reflexive (resp. synthetic). In the following, we consider the converse question: when does the reflexivity (resp. synthesis) of $\mathcal{W}$ imply the reflexivity (resp. synthesis) of $\mathcal{U}$? This is not true in general. For an example, take $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{B}(H_1, H_2)$ and a non-reflexive (resp. non-synthetic) $\mathcal{D}_2, \mathcal{D}_1$-bimodule $\mathcal{U}$. We show that in certain cases, when the masa-bimodules $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{M}$ are "suitably positioned", one can obtain positive results.

If $\mathcal{N}$ is a weak* closed masa-bimodule, we will say that a weak* closed masa-bimodule $\mathcal{U}$ is $\mathcal{N}$-synthetic if $\mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\kappa) \cap \mathcal{N} = \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa) \cap \mathcal{N}$, where κ is the (unique up to marginal equivalence) ω-closed subset of $X \times Y$ with $\mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\kappa) \subseteq \mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa)$. This notion was introduced and studied in [15] in the case $X = Y = G$ for some locally compact group G.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an approximately $\mathfrak{I}$-injective masa-bimodule and $\mathcal{U}$ be a weak* closed $\mathcal{M}$-synthetic masa–bimodule. Then*

(i) $\mathcal{U}$ is reflexive if and only if $\mathcal{U} + \mathcal{M}$ is reflexive;

(ii) $\mathcal{U}$ is synthetic if and only if $\mathcal{U} + \mathcal{M}$ is synthetic.

Proof. (i) By Corollary 3.4 and Proposition 4.1, if $\mathcal{U}$ is reflexive (resp. synthetic) then $\mathcal{U} + \mathcal{M}$ is reflexive (resp. synthetic). Conversely, assume that $\mathcal{U} + \mathcal{M}$ is reflexive and let $T \in \operatorname{Ref}\mathcal{U}$. Let $\mathcal{E}_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence of Schur idempotents such that $\cap_{n=1}^{\infty} \operatorname{Ran}\mathcal{E}_n = \mathcal{M}$ and $\|\mathcal{E}_n\| \leq C$ for some $C > 0$.

By Corollary 3.4, $T \in (\operatorname{Ref}\mathcal{U}) + \mathcal{M} = \operatorname{Ref}(\mathcal{U} + \mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{U} + \mathcal{M}$. Thus, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that $T = S_n + M_n$ for some $S_n \in \mathcal{U}$ and $M_n \in \mathcal{M}_n$. It follows that $\mathcal{E}_n^\perp(T) = \mathcal{E}_n^\perp(S_n) \in \mathcal{U}$. On the other hand, by Proposition 2.2 (iii), $\mathcal{E}_n(T) = \mathcal{E}_n(S_n) + M_n \in \operatorname{Ref}(\mathcal{U}) \cap \mathcal{M}_n$. If S is the weak* limit of a subsequence $(\mathcal{E}_{n_k}(T))_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ then $S \in \operatorname{Ref}(\mathcal{U}) \cap \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{M}$ since $\mathcal{U}$ is $\mathcal{M}$-synthetic. It follows that

$$T = \text{w*-}\lim(\mathcal{E}_{n_k}(T) + \mathcal{E}_{n_k}^\perp(T)) \in \mathcal{U}.$$

(ii) Suppose that $\mathcal{U} + \mathcal{M}$ is synthetic and let $\mathcal{U}_{\min}$ be the minimal weak* closed masa-bimodule with reflexive cover $\operatorname{Ref}\mathcal{U}$. By Corollary 3.4,

$$\operatorname{Ref}(\mathcal{U}_{\min} + \mathcal{M}) = (\operatorname{Ref}\mathcal{U}_{\min}) + \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{U} + \mathcal{M}.$$

Since $\mathcal{U} + \mathcal{M}$ is synthetic, $\mathcal{U}_{\min} + \mathcal{M}$ (which is weak* closed by Theorem 2.5 (i)) is reflexive. By the first paragraph, $\mathcal{U}_{\min}$ is reflexive; thus, $\mathcal{U}_{\min} = \operatorname{Ref}\mathcal{U}$ and so $\mathcal{U}$ is synthetic. □

Theorem 6.2. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a weak* closed ternary masa-bimodule, $\mathcal{A}_1 = [\mathcal{M}^*\mathcal{M}]^{-w^*}$ and $\mathcal{A}_2 = [\mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}^*]^{-w^*}$. Suppose that $\mathcal{U}$ is a weak* closed $\mathcal{A}_2, \mathcal{A}_1$-bimodule. The following hold:*

(i) The masa-bimodule $\mathcal{U} + \mathcal{M}$ is reflexive if and only if $\mathcal{U}$ is reflexive.

(ii) The masa-bimodule $\mathcal{U} + \mathcal{M}$ is synthetic if and only if $\mathcal{U}$ is synthetic.

Proof. It follows from [24, Proposition 2.2] that (after a unitary equivalence) $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \mathcal{M}_2$, where $\mathcal{M}_1$ has the form $\oplus_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\mathcal{B}(H_1^k, H_2^k)$, for some Hilbert spaces H_1^k, H_2^k, and $\mathcal{M}_2$ is a ternary masa-bimodule which does not contain operators of rank one. It follows that $\mathcal{A}_1$ (resp. $\mathcal{A}_2$) contains $\oplus_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\mathcal{B}(H_1^k)$ (resp. $\oplus_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\mathcal{B}(H_2^k)$). Since $\mathcal{U}$ is an $\mathcal{A}_2, \mathcal{A}_1$-bimodule, we have that $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}_1 \oplus \mathcal{U}_2$, where $\mathcal{U}_1 = \oplus_{p=1}^\infty \mathcal{B}(H_1^{k_p}, H_2^{k_p})$ and $\mathcal{U}_2$ is a weak* closed $\mathcal{A}_2, \mathcal{A}_1$-bimodule.

Let $\kappa \subseteq X \times Y$ (resp. $\sigma \subseteq X \times Y$) be the ω-closed set such that $\mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\kappa) \subseteq \mathcal{U}_2 \subseteq \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa)$ (resp. $\mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\sigma) = \mathcal{M}_2$). We have that

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\kappa \cap \sigma) \subseteq \mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\kappa) \cap \mathcal{M}_2 \subseteq \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa) \cap \mathcal{M}_2 = \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa \cap \sigma).$$

By [24, Theorem 3.6], $\kappa \cap \sigma$ is operator synthetic, and hence $\mathfrak{M}_{\min}(\kappa) \cap \mathcal{M}_2 = \mathfrak{M}_{\max}(\kappa) \cap \mathcal{M}_2$, that is, $\mathcal{U}_2$ is $\mathcal{M}_2$-synthetic. It follows that $\mathcal{U}$ is $\mathcal{M}$-synthetic and the claims follow from Theorem 6.1. □

Theorem 6.2 has the following immediate consequence.

Corollary 6.3. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a CSL algebra, $\Delta(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{A}^*$ be the diagonal of $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{U}$ be a weak* closed subspace of $\mathcal{A}$ which is a $\Delta(\mathcal{A})$-bimodule and such that $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{U} + \Delta(\mathcal{A})$. Then*

(i) the space $\mathcal{U}$ is reflexive;

(ii) the algebra $\mathcal{A}$ is synthetic if and only if the space $\mathcal{U}$ is synthetic.

Acknowledgement We would like to thank A. Katavolos for numerous helpful discussions on the topic of this paper.

References

[1] W.B. Arveson, *Analyticity in operator algebras*, Amer. J. Math. 89 (1967), 578-642

[2] W.B. Arveson, *Operator algebras and invariant subspaces*, Ann. Math. (2) 100 (1974), 433-532

[3] D.P. Blecher and C. Le Merdy, *Operator algebras and their modules – an operator space approach*, Oxford University Press, 2004

[4] J. A. Erdos, , A. Katavolos, and V. S. Shulman, *Rank one subspaces of bimodules over maximal abelian selfadjoint algebras*, J. Funct. Anal. 157 (1998) no. 2, 554-587

[5] J.A. Erdos and S.C. Power, *Weakly closed ideals of nest algebras*, J. Operator Theory 7 (1982), no. 2, 219-235

[6] K.R. Davidson, *Nest algebras*, Longman Scientific and Technical, (1988)

[7] J. Froelich *Compact Operators, Invariant Subspaces and Spectral Synthesis*, J. Funct. Analysis 81 (1988), 1-37

[8] U. Haagerup, *Decomposition of completely bounded maps on operator algebras*, unpublished manuscript

[9] J.L. Habgood and I.G. Todorov, *Convergence of bimodules over maximal abelian selfadjoint algebras*, J. Operator Theory 63 (2010), no. 3, 301-315

[10] R. G. Haydon and V. S. Shulman, *On a measure-theoretical problem of Arveson*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 124 (1996), 497-503

[11] A. Katavolos and V. Paulsen, *On the ranges of bimodule projections*, Canad. Math. Bull. 48 (2005) no. 1, 97-111

[12] A. Katavolos and I.G. Todorov, *Normalizers of operator algebras and reflexivity*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) 86 (2003), 463-484

[13] A.I. Loginov and V.S.Shulman, *Hereditary and intermediate reflexivity of W*-algebras*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR 39 (1975), 1260-1273; Math. USSR-Izv. 9 (1975), 1189-1201

[14] J. Ludwig and L. Turowska, *On the connection between sets of operator synthesis and sets of spectral synthesis for locally compact groups*, J. Funct. Anal. 233 (2006), 206-227

[15] K. Parthasarathy and R. Prakash, *Spectral synthesis and operator synthesis*, Studia Math. 177 (2006), No. 2, 173-181

[16] V. Paulsen, *Completely bounded maps and operator algebras*, Cambridge University Press, 2002

[17] V.V. Peller, *Hankel operators in the theory of perturbations of unitary and selfadjoint operators*, Functional Anal. Appl. 19 (1985), no. 2, 111-123

[18] N. Spronk and L. Turowska, *Spectral synthesis and operator synthesis for compact groups*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) 66 (2002), 361-376

[19] V.S. Shulman, *Multiplication operators and spectral synthesis*, Soviet Math. Dokl. 42 (1991), no. 1, 133-137

[20] V.S. Shulman and L. Turowska, *Operator synthesis I. Synthetic sets, bilattices and tensor algebras*, J. Funct. Anal. 209 (2004), 293-331

[21] V.S. Shulman and L. Turowska, *Operator synthesis II: Individual synthesis and linear operator equations* J. Reine Angew. Math. 590 (2006), 143–187

[22] R. R. Smith, *Completely bounded module maps and the Haagerup tensor product*, J. Funct. Anal. 102 (1991), 156-175

[23] I.G. Todorov, *Spectral synthesis and masa-bimodules*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) 65 (2002), no. 3, 733-744

[24] I.G. Todorov, *Synthetic properties of ternary masa-bimodules*, Houston J. Math. 32 (2006), no. 2, 505-519

[25] I.G. Todorov and L. Turowska, *Closable multipliers on group algebras*, preprint

Department of Mathematics, University of Athens, Panepistimioupolis 157 84, Athens, Greece
E-mail address: `gelefth@math.uoa.gr`

Department of Pure Mathematics, Queen's University Belfast, Belfast BT7 1NN, United Kingdom
E-mail address: `i.todorov@qub.ac.uk`